



E-FAN-01-001

December 2000

Study of Arizona Adults Leaving the Food Stamp Program

Final Report

Prepared by Gregory Mills and Robert Kornfeld
of Abt Associates Inc.

ERS contact: Thomas Carlin

Abstract

This study examined the situation of adults in Arizona who left the Food Stamp Program in 1997. Adults with dependents or a disability who did not receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) at any time during the 12 months preceding their food stamp exit showed the highest degree of self-sufficiency (independence from both public benefits and private support and higher earnings). Adults with dependents or a disability who received TANF at some time during the 12 months preceding their exit improved the most in their post-exit employment situation. Able-bodied adults without dependents and adults with dependents or a disability who received TANF showed the strongest evidence of post-exit hardship and deprivation (living with family or friends while paying no rent or partial rent, no health insurance coverage, and food insecure with moderate or severe hunger).

This report was prepared by Abt Associates Inc., under a research grant from the Economic Research Service. The views expressed are those of Abt and not necessarily those of ERS or USDA.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Data Sources | 2 |
| Transitions to Self-Sufficiency | 2 |
| Administratively-Reported Outcomes | 4 |
| Survey-Reported Employment and Income | 5 |
| Survey-Reported Household Arrangements | 5 |
| Survey-Reported Economic Security | 6 |
| | |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 9 |
| 1.1 Background | 9 |
| 1.2 Subgroups of Exiters Under Study | 13 |
| 1.3 Data Sources | 17 |
| Administrative Data | 17 |
| Survey Data | 19 |
| 1.4 Organization of This Report | 28 |
| | |
| Chapter 2: Administratively-Reported Outcomes | 29 |
| 2.1 Program Participation of Adult Exiters | 30 |
| Program Status at Exit | 30 |
| Receipt of Food Stamps | 30 |
| Receipt of Cash Assistance | 32 |
| Participation in Medicaid | 33 |
| Participation in JOBS | 34 |
| 2.2 Employment of Adult Exiters | 35 |
| Covered Employment | 36 |
| Earnings from Covered Employment | 37 |
| 2.3 Household-Level Outcomes | 38 |
| Child Support Payments | 38 |
| Child Care Assistance | 38 |
| Emergency Assistance | 38 |
| Reported Child Maltreatment | 41 |
| Combined Administratively-Reported Income | 42 |
| | |
| Chapter 3: Survey-Reported Employment and Income | 45 |
| 3.1 Employment | 46 |
| Education and Training | 46 |
| Employment Rate | 46 |
| Job Situation for Those Employed | 50 |
| Reasons for Not Working | 50 |
| 3.2 Health Insurance | 56 |
| 3.3 Household Income | 61 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Chapter 4: Survey-Reported Household Arrangements | 67 |
| 4.1 Household Size and Housing Status | 67 |
| 4.2 Marital Status | 69 |
| 4.3 Child Care Arrangements | 73 |
| Chapter 5: Survey-Reported Economic Security | 81 |
| 5.1 Perceived Well-Being | 81 |
| 5.2 Food Security | 83 |
| 5.3 Material Hardship | 85 |
| 5.4 Help Received from Others | 88 |
| Chapter 6: Concluding Assessment | 91 |
| 6.1 Interpreting the Evidence | 91 |
| 6.2 Comparing the Subgroup Experiences | 92 |
| Which Subgroup Achieved the Highest Degree of Self-Sufficiency? | 92 |
| Which Subgroup Showed the Greatest Stability or Improvement in Its Employment Situation Since Exit? | 93 |
| Which Subgroup Was Most at Risk of Hardship or Deprivation? | 93 |

Appendix A: Survey of Arizona Adults Leaving the Food Stamp Program

Appendix B: Categorization of Exit Codes

Executive Summary

This study examines the situation of Arizona adults who left the Food Stamp Program during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix metropolitan area. The objectives of this study were:

- to examine the reasons for leaving food stamps and household circumstances at the time of program exit, and
- to examine post-exit outcomes related to employment and earnings, sources of public and private support (including food stamp recidivism), child support, child care, child welfare, housing arrangements, and food security.

More generally, the study seeks to establish the extent to which such exiters made a successful transition to economic self-sufficiency—and the extent to which they may have experienced economic hardship. This research was conducted by Abt Associates in collaboration with the Arizona Department of Economic Security.

The experiences of one category of food stamp exiters, able-bodied adults without dependents (or ABAWDs), were of particular interest. Many of these individuals left food stamps as a result of tightened work requirements enacted under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. Able-bodied individuals aged 18 to 50 without children or other dependents can receive food stamps for only three months in a 36-month period unless they are employed, are engaged in an approved work or training program, or are exempt from these requirements.

For purposes of this study, a food stamp “leaver” or “exiter” was defined as any individual food stamp participant who left the program for a period of two or more consecutive months starting in calendar year 1997. Those who left for only one month were not included, to minimize the extent to which the study universe included exits associated with very brief periods without assistance.

The universe of exiters for this study was divided into three distinct subgroups, as follows:

1. **Non-exempt ABAWD exiters (the “ABAWD subgroup”).** This subgroup consisted of those exiters who were able-bodied adults (18 to 50 years old) without dependents, and who were not exempt from the ABAWD work requirements. These requirements, if not met, limited the individual to three months of benefits in a 36-month period.
2. **Non-ABAWD TANF exiters (the “TANF subgroup”).** This subgroup consisted of non-ABAWD individuals who received TANF cash assistance at some time during the 12 months preceding their food stamp exit. As prior TANF recipients, these individuals are typically members of low-income families with children. This includes both children and their parents or caretaker relatives.

3. **Non-ABAWD non-TANF exiters (the “non-TANF subgroup”).** This subgroup consisted of non-ABAWD individuals who did not receive TANF cash assistance at any time during the 12 months preceding their food stamp exit. This includes families whose incomes were too high to qualify for cash assistance, and single individuals or childless couples over age 50 or disabled.

The decomposition of the universe into these subgroups reflects both the special interest in those subject to the federally imposed ABAWD time limit and the presumption among state agency staff that, for non-ABAWDs, those with and those without prior TANF receipt constitute two very different subpopulations. Those who received cash assistance in the prior year are a lower income subgroup and may be more likely to have experienced hardship upon leaving food stamps.

Data Sources

Relevant administrative data for the statewide universe of 1997 food stamp exiters were compiled from the state’s automated program files. Identifying information on these individuals (e.g., case identification number, client number, and/or social security number) was used to link with other state databases and to extract the data needed for the analysis of food stamp exiters statewide. File extracts were prepared for each of the following types of administrative data:

- TANF cash assistance receipt, food stamp receipt, and Medicaid eligibility;
- JOBS participation and activities;
- child care assistance;
- child support payments;
- child welfare;
- emergency assistance; and
- wages reported through the state’s unemployment insurance system.

These files covered the period January 1997 through March 1999.

To address important post-exit outcomes not available through administrative data, a survey was conducted on a sample of the adult food stamp exiters in the Phoenix metropolitan area, including both Maricopa and Pinal Counties. During May-October 1999, a total of 696 individuals were interviewed: 90 in the ABAWD subgroup, 322 in the TANF subgroup, and 284 in the non-TANF subgroup. Of the 696 interviews, 389 were completed by telephone interviewer, and 307 were completed by field interviewer. The overall response rate for the survey was 54 percent.

Transitions to Self-Sufficiency

This study addressed three major questions comparing the ABAWD, TANF, and non-TANF subgroups as to their self-sufficiency, improved employment situation since exit, and risk of hardship or deprivation.

Which Subgroup Achieved the Highest Degree of Self-Sufficiency?

It was the non-TANF subgroup that showed the highest degree of self-sufficiency, in terms of independence from both public benefits and private support. Compared to the other subgroups, the non-TANF exiters achieved:

- the highest levels of administratively-reported earnings (average quarterly earnings in post-exit covered employment) and survey-reported earnings (average monthly earnings at paid work); and
- the lowest rate of help received from family and friends.

To some degree, these findings reflected the more favorable demographic characteristics of the non-TANF exiters, who were comparatively older and more likely to be married and homeowners.

Which Subgroup Showed the Greatest Stability or Improvement in Its Employment Situation Since Exit?

Those in the TANF subgroup experienced the greatest improvement in their employment situation following their food stamp exit. In particular, the TANF subgroup achieved:

- a rate of covered employment as high in follow-up quarter 5 as at exit, while the rate dropped markedly for the other subgroups over this period; and
- the highest absolute and proportional increase between quarters 0 and 5 in quarterly earnings from covered employment.

Which Subgroup Was Most at Risk of Hardship or Deprivation?

Among the three subgroups, it was the ABAWD and TANF subgroups that showed the strongest evidence of post-exit hardship and deprivation, in the following respects:

- the highest percentages living with family or friends while paying no rent or partial rent;
- the highest percentages with no health insurance coverage; and
- the highest percentages classified as food insecure with moderate or severe hunger.

Both the ABAWD and TANF subgroups showed high levels of material hardship and help received from friends or family and from private organizations, also indicative of their more frequent inability to meet basic living needs.

The high rate of food insecurity with hunger found among ABAWD exiters—34 percent—is noteworthy. This incidence is more than twice the 1999 national rate of 14 percent estimated by USDA for households at or below 50 percent of the poverty level, even though most ABAWDs have incomes above the poverty level. The ABAWD finding highlights the importance of considering (in this and other exit studies) whether exiters who appear self-sufficient, in terms of their reduced reliance on public and private support, are able to avoid hardship and deprivation.

The following sections summarize the more detailed findings of this study, as derived from the analysis of both administrative and survey data.

Administratively-Reported Outcomes

The empirical analysis conducted in this study focused first on the post-exit status of food stamp exiters as reflected in administrative data. Three major categories of outcomes were examined: participation of adult exiters in the major federally-supported means-tested programs (food stamps, cash assistance, Medicaid, and JOBS); employment of adult exiters; and case-level outcomes and combined household income. The key findings with respect to these administratively-reported outcomes were as follows:

- Among adult exiters in the three subgroups under study, those in the TANF subgroup experienced the highest rates of post-exit participation in food stamps, cash assistance, Medicaid, and JOBS. More than one-third (35 percent) of the TANF subgroup returned to food stamps within five quarters of their exit.
- The adult exiters in the TANF subgroup experienced the highest rates of employment in jobs covered by unemployment insurance, compared to the other subgroups. In each of the first five follow-up quarters, more than one-half (53 percent) of the TANF exiters were so employed. For each of the other two subgroups, the employment rates in each quarter were two to six percentage points lower than those for the TANF subgroup.
- For average quarterly earnings in covered employment among adult exiters, the TANF subgroup showed the largest increase between the exit quarter and quarter 5, in both absolute and proportional terms. In each quarter, it was the non-TANF subgroup that experienced the highest level of quarterly earnings in covered employment among the three subgroups, reaching \$1,700 by follow-up quarter 5. (Included in the computed averages were those without earnings.)
- In terms of case-level receipt of other program assistance, it was again the TANF subgroup that experienced the highest levels of participation. The percentage of cases in this subgroup that received various forms of program support at some point during the first five follow-up quarters was as follows: 14 percent for child support payments, 16 percent for child care assistance, 5 percent for emergency assistance, and 5 percent for child welfare services.
- For combined administratively-reported income (consisting of food stamps, cash assistance, earnings, child support payments, child care assistance, and emergency assistance, aggregated to the case level), the ABAWD subgroup experienced the highest proportional increase (17 percent) between the exit quarter and follow-up quarter 5, followed by the non-TANF subgroup (14 percent) and the TANF subgroup (11 percent).

Survey-Reported Employment and Income

The analysis focused next on evidence from the survey of Arizona food stamp exiters with respect to their employment, job-related benefits, health insurance, and income. Such outcomes included education and training status, employment status, reasons for not working, employer-provided benefits, health insurance coverage, and household income. The key findings were as follows:

- More than 70 percent of exiters had not completed high school; 15 percent were engaged in some education or training activity at the time of the interview.
- 50 percent of exiters were employed at the time of the interview, with the ABAWD subgroup having the highest employment rate, at 62 percent. Average monthly earnings for those employed at the interview was \$1,474.
- For unemployed exiters, the main reasons for not working pertained to illness, health, problems, or disability (51 percent of those not employed) and the need or desire to stay home with children (22 percent of those not employed).
- Fully 46 percent of exiters had no health insurance coverage. Another 38 percent received their health coverage through Medicaid, Medicare, and other sources unrelated to their employment. The remaining 16 percent had employer-provided health insurance, sometimes combined with other coverage.
- Including both earned and unearned sources of money income, monthly household income averaged \$1,473 for all exiters. Income as a percentage of the federal poverty level averaged 114 percent. The percentage with incomes below the poverty level was highest for the TANF subgroup (55 percent).

Survey-Reported Household Arrangements

The survey also addressed the situation of exiters regarding their basic household arrangements. The outcomes examined here included household size, housing status, marital status, and child care arrangements. The key survey-reported findings with respect to these outcomes were as follows:

- 62 percent of respondents in the ABAWD subgroup were living either alone or with one other person. In contrast, 44 percent of the TANF respondents and 32 percent of the non-TANF respondents were in households with at least four other persons.
- More than one-half of the respondents in each subgroup rented their home or apartment. The extent of homeownership was greatest among the non-TANF respondents, at 25 percent.

- Among the three subgroups, 7 to 13 percent of respondents received Section 8 rental assistance, 6 to 12 percent were in public housing, and 1 to 2 percent lived either “on the street” or in a group shelter.
- The percentage of respondents residing with a spouse or partner at both the exit month and the interview month was highest for the non-TANF subgroup (at 34 percent), followed by the ABAWD subgroup (at 25 percent) and the TANF subgroup (at 23 percent).
- Among the children 12 years or younger of non-ABAWD survey respondents, more than three-fourths (77 percent) were not in any regular child care arrangement for any part of the day.
- For those children in regular child care among non-ABAWD exiters, more than two-thirds (69 percent) of their parents were “very satisfied” with the arrangement and nearly one-fourth (24 percent) were “satisfied.”
- Among the non-ABAWD respondents with children in regular child care, more than two-thirds (72 percent) made some payment for it. Less than one quarter (23 percent) received any help in paying for child care.

Survey-Reported Economic Security

The analysis focused last on the ability of food stamp exiters to meet their basic household living needs during the post-exit period. The survey-reported outcomes analyzed here included satisfaction with one’s standard of living and financial situation, level of food security, material hardship, and help received from family, friends, or outside organizations. The key findings were as follows:

- 30 percent of exiters were “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” with their overall standard of living, 54 percent expressed dissatisfaction with their financial situation, and 33 percent indicated that “there is not enough to make ends meet” at the end of the month.
- Using food security measurement methods developed by USDA, 31 percent of exiters were classified as “food insecure without hunger” and another 23 percent were “food insecure with hunger.” These rates of food insecurity exceeded national estimates for very low income households (those below 50 percent of the federal poverty level). The incidence of food insecurity with moderate or severe hunger was highest among the ABAWD subgroup, at 34 percent.
- More than one-half of exiters (56 percent) reported have experienced at least one of a number of specified forms of material hardship. These included forgoing a dentist visit (36 percent), forgoing a doctor or hospital visit (24 percent), inability to pay rent or mortgage (32 percent, including evictions), and inability to pay utility bills (27 percent). These health-related and housing-related hardships were most pronounced among TANF exiters.

- Most exiters (62 percent) received some form of help from friends or family in the year preceding the interview. For all subgroups combined, the most prevalent forms of such help were emotional support (37 percent), money (27 percent), and food (also 27 percent).
- More than one-third of exiters (38 percent) received help from community organizations, neighborhood centers, or religious organizations in the previous 12 months. The TANF subgroup had the highest reported incidence (44 percent). For the subgroups combined, the most frequently reported form of outside help was food from a food bank (25 percent).

Chapter 1

Introduction

This study examines the situation of Arizona adults who left the Food Stamp Program (FSP) during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix metropolitan area. The objectives of this study are:

- to examine the reasons for leaving food stamps and household circumstances at the time of program exit; and
- to examine post-exit outcomes related to employment and earnings, sources of public and private support (including food stamp recidivism), child support, child care, child welfare, housing arrangements, and food security.

More generally, the study seeks to establish the extent to which such exiters made a successful transition to economic self-sufficiency—and the extent to which they may have experienced economic hardship.¹

The experiences of one category of food stamp exiters, able-bodied adults without dependents (or ABAWDs), are of particular interest. Many of these individuals left food stamps in the context of tightened work requirements enacted under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. Able-bodied individuals aged 18 to 50 without children or other dependents can receive food stamps for only three months in a 36-month period unless they are employed, are engaged in an approved work or training program, or are exempt from this requirement.

1.1 Background

The reference year for this exit study, calendar year 1997, came during a period in which food stamp participation was dropping dramatically both nationwide and in Arizona. As shown in Exhibit 1-1, food stamp participation levels (by federal fiscal year) peaked in 1994. Through the remainder of the decade, the subsequent annual decline in recipients was even more pronounced in Arizona than nationwide. Note that by 1999 the average monthly number of food stamp recipients in Arizona had fallen to one-half its 1994 level (257,000 versus 512,000).

To an important extent, the drop in food stamp participation for both the nation and Arizona reflected strengthening economic conditions during the 1990s. As shown in Exhibit 1-2, the decline in unemployment rates began in 1993, having reached levels that approached or exceeded 7 percent for the U.S., Arizona statewide, and the Phoenix-Mesa Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). By the end of the decade, the corresponding annual unemployment rates had fallen to nearly 4 percent nationwide

¹ This research was initiated in October 1998, and was conducted by Abt Associates in collaboration with the Arizona Department of Economic Security (ADES), under a grant from the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Exhibit 1-1**Trends in Food Stamp Participation, U.S. and Arizona, 1990-1999**

| Federal Fiscal Year | United States | | Arizona | |
|---------------------|--|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| | Average Monthly Recipients (thousands) | Percentage Change | Average Monthly Recipients (thousands) | Percentage Change |
| 1990 | 21,510 | – | 317 | – |
| 1991 | 24,105 | +12 | 388 | +22 |
| 1992 | 26,888 | +8 | 457 | +18 |
| 1993 | 28,426 | +6 | 489 | +7 |
| 1994 | 28,888 | +2 | 512 | +5 |
| 1995 | 27,995 | –3 | 480 | –6 |
| 1996 | 26,871 | –4 | 427 | –11 |
| 1997 | 23,117 | –14 | 352 | –18 |
| 1998 | 19,969 | –14 | 292 | –17 |
| 1999 | 18,188 | –9 | 257 | –12 |

Sources: U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, *1998 Green Book*; USDA/FNS, *Characteristics of Food Stamp Households*, 1997 and 1998; and unpublished data from ADES.

Exhibit 1-2**Unemployment Rates, U.S. and Arizona, 1990-1999**

| Federal Fiscal Year | United States | Arizona | |
|---|---------------|-----------|-------------------------------|
| | | Statewide | Phoenix-Mesa MSA ^a |
| Annual average unemployment rate (%), civilian non-institutional population, 16 years of age and over | | | |
| 1990 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 4.6 |
| 1991 | 6.8 | 5.8 | 5.1 |
| 1992 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 6.6 |
| 1993 | 6.9 | 6.3 | 5.0 |
| 1994 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 4.7 |
| 1995 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 3.5 |
| 1996 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 3.7 |
| 1997 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 3.0 |
| 1998 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 2.7 |
| 1999 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 3.0 |

a Phoenix-Mesa MSA includes Maricopa and Pinal Counties.

Sources: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

and statewide, and to 3 percent for the Phoenix-Mesa labor market, which consists of Maricopa and Pinal Counties.

At the same time, as economic conditions were improving during the mid and late 1990s, major policy changes at the federal and state levels also contributed to the decline in food stamp participation. At the federal level, the following changes to tighten food stamp eligibility policy were enacted and became effective in Arizona on October 1, 1996:

- As noted above, non-exempt ABAWDs who were unemployed or were not engaged in approved work-related activity were limited to 3 months of food stamp eligibility in any 36-month period.
- Benefits were reduced to households in which a member quit a job voluntarily or without good cause, or reduced work hours to below 30 hours per week. The entire household became ineligible if it was the head of household who quit a job or reduced work hours.
- Also to be removed from the food stamp household, with a lowering of the monthly food stamp benefit, were members sanctioned in the cash assistance program for failing to cooperate with child support or Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) requirements.
- Children aged 21 years or younger living together with their parents were required to include themselves in the same food stamp household as their parents.
- Restrictions on food stamp eligibility were instituted for aliens. Those classified as refugee, asylee, or under a withheld deportation order were limited to five years of food stamp eligibility from the date on which the Immigration and Naturalization Service granted their status. Permanent resident aliens, in order to receive food stamps, needed to meet tightened criteria regarding employment (i.e., 40 qualifying quarters of earnings) or military service, depending on the date of their entry into the U.S. For sponsored aliens, the income and resources of the sponsor and their spouse became countable.
- More severe penalties (up to permanent disqualification) were instituted for intentional program violations, including food stamp trafficking, trading stamps for drugs, or making false statements about residency or identity.
- Other minor changes were implemented in rules regarding countable income and income deductions, expedited service, and collection of overpayments.

To the extent that changes in cash assistance policy may also have affected food stamp participation, it is important to note the major initiatives that were implemented in Arizona with respect to cash assistance eligibility and benefits. Several waves of reform occurred, first under federal waivers relating to Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and then under the block grant flexibility allowed states in setting their plans for Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

One set of reforms was implemented statewide in November 1995 under the state’s EMPOWER initiative (for “Employing and Moving People Off Welfare and Encouraging Responsibility”). EMPOWER included the following policy changes:

- Limited cash assistance for adults to 24 months in any 60-month period. (Pre-EMPOWER policy applied no time limit on cash assistance.)
- Eliminated any increase in a family’s monthly cash grant for bearing additional children while on assistance. (Pre-EMPOWER policy provided for an increase in the monthly payment for each additional child born to the case.)
- Required that unwed parents under the age of 18 live with a responsible adult to qualify for cash assistance. (No such restriction existed under pre-EMPOWER policy.)
- Established mandatory participation in the JOBS program for parents aged 13 through 19. (Under pre-EMPOWER policy, JOBS participation was mandatory for parents aged 16 through 19, but was voluntary for those aged 13 through 15.)
- Imposed an automatic, minimum one-month sanction for the first instance of noncompliance with JOBS requirements. (Under pre-EMPOWER policy, the first sanction could be waived—“cured”—if the client agreed to comply within the first month.) As described later, this provision of EMPOWER was later superseded by an even stronger set of sanctions implemented by the state in August 1997.
- Extended eligibility for Transitional Medical Assistance (TMA) and Transitional Child Care (TCC) from 12 to 24 months after a case became ineligible for cash assistance because of employment. (Under pre-EMPOWER policy, such assistance was limited in duration to 12 months.)
- Eliminated the “100-hour rule” that made two-parent families ineligible for cash assistance if the primary wage earner worked more than 100 hours per month. (Under pre-EMPOWER policy, the 100-hour limit applied both to new applicants and ongoing recipients.)

The EMPOWER legislation allowed for certain categories of individuals to be exempt from time-limited assistance (e.g., disabled or incapacitated adults), from the family benefit cap (e.g., births resulting from sexual assault or incest), and from the unwed minor parent restrictions (e.g., situations endangering the health or safety of the parent or child). As a result of the federal Budget Reconciliation Act of 1997, Indian reservations with unemployment rates exceeding 50 percent were also exempted from both federal and state time limits on TANF-funded cash assistance. On this basis, the Navajo reservation and others in Arizona became exempt from time limits.²

² Beginning in 2002, when the EMPOWER policy waiver will expire, the State will become subject to the PRWORA-mandated 60-month **lifetime** limit on the receipt of TANF-funded assistance. Under PRWORA, TANF funds cannot be used to provide benefits or services to any case with an adult member who has received TANF assistance for 60 or more months during his or her lifetime.

In August 1997 the state then implemented a second wave of welfare reform under the title “EMPOWER Redesign.” This initiative included the following provisions:

- Personal Responsibility Agreement, requiring that the primary information (PI) member of any case applying for or receiving assistance must commit to complying with requirements regarding JOBS participation, cooperation with child support enforcement, child immunization, and school attendance.
- Progressive sanctions for failure to comply with the terms of the Personal Responsibility Agreement, calling for reductions in the family’s monthly cash grant by 25, 50, and 100 percent for the first, second, and third months of noncompliance, respectively.
- Removal of nearly all adult exemptions from JOBS participation, including those that had previously applied to those caring for young children and those residing in remote areas of the state.
- Local office administrative reforms aimed at establishing a more employment-focused “work first” pattern of client flow, first offering job-finding resources and services to applicants while considering eligibility for cash assistance and other income support.

The Redesign policy changes became effective in August 1997, and the administrative reforms were phased in across the state during late 1997 and throughout 1998. Also in late 1997, the state implemented finger imaging as a requirement of receiving cash assistance and food stamps for adult clients and instituted an electronic benefit transfer (EBT) system for both programs.

1.2 Subgroups of Exiters Under Study

For purposes of this study, a food stamp “leaver” or “exiter” was defined as any individual food stamp participant who left the program for a period of two or more consecutive months during calendar year 1997. Those who left for only one month were not included, to minimize the extent to which the universe included exits associated with very brief absences from the program. Individuals were regarded as participating in the program in those months for which benefits were later provided retroactively. For instance, if a recipient left the program for two months, but was later reinstated with benefits provided retroactively for one or both months, the individual did not enter the study.

The individual food stamp participant was defined as the unit of observation so that the study could more fully address those situations in which the ABAWD requirements resulted in a loss or reduction of benefits. In some states, including Arizona, a food stamp household can include some ABAWD members and some non-ABAWD members, all participating under the same case number. The case does not close when an ABAWD member exits the program; the other case members remain participants.³ Such a case would not enter the study under any alternative rule in which the household was the unit of observation.

³ Examples of such situations are cases with a child over 18 living at home or where an adult male resides with his sister and her children.

By defining the individual participant as the unit of observation, the study also included individuals who lost eligibility as a result of noncompliance with immigrant provisions (e.g., the 40-quarter work rule) or food stamp employment and training requirements.

The total universe of exiters examined in this study was comprised of three distinct subgroups, as follows:

- (1) **Non-exempt ABAWD exiters (hereafter, the “ABAWD subgroup”)**. This subgroup of exiters consists of able-bodied adults (18 to 50 years old) without dependents who were not exempt from the ABAWD work requirements. These requirements, if not met, limited the individual to three months of benefits in a 36-month period.⁴ Exemptions to these requirements were granted to those residing in a geographic area with insufficient jobs or high unemployment. In Arizona, the exempt areas included the following counties, regarded as having insufficient jobs: Apache, Cochise, Coconino (excluding Flagstaff), Gila, Graham, Greenlee, La Paz, Mohave (excluding Lake Havasu City), Navajo, Santa Cruz, and Yuma. The work requirements applied in the remaining counties—Maricopa, Pima, Pinal, and Yavapai—except for the following reservations, which were regarded as having high unemployment (10 percent or more): Gila River, Pascua Yaqui, Salt River, San Carlos Apache, and Tohono O’Odham.⁵ Exemptions were also granted to those in specified personal circumstances.⁶

- (2) **Non-ABAWD TANF exiters (hereafter, the “TANF subgroup”)**. This subgroup consisted of non-ABAWD individuals who received TANF cash assistance at some time during the 12 months preceding their food stamp exit. As prior TANF recipients, these individuals are typically members of low-income families with children. This includes both children and their parents or caretaker relatives.⁷

4 In the state’s administrative data, these individuals are shown as having complied with the “able-bodied work requirements” under one of the following codes:

- EM employed (including self-employment, volunteer, and in-kind work)
- PC enrolled in Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program, Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), Food Stamp Employment and Training (FSE&T), or Refugee Resettlement Program (RRP)
- ST enrolled at least half-time as a student in high school, college, trade or technical school
- WN mandatory participant in JOBS program for cash assistance recipients
- UI receiving unemployment insurance

The other individuals in this subgroup were subject to, but had not complied with, the ABAWD work requirements. For such persons, a food stamp exit would presumably have occurred upon their reaching the third month of receipt in a 36-month period.

5 For the Gila River and Salt River reservations, the waiver became effective on July 1, 1998.

6 These individuals were identified in the administrative data as having one of the following exemption codes:

- GE residing in an area of high unemployment
- DI physical or mental disability
- PG pregnant woman
- NC responsible for the care of an incapacitated individual
- DR participating in a drug addiction or alcohol treatment or rehabilitation program

7 One can further divide this subgroup as follows: those who left cash assistance prior to their food stamp exit, those who left cash assistance and food stamps simultaneously, and those who remained on cash assistance following their food stamp exit.

- (3) **Non-ABAWD non-TANF exiters (hereafter, the “non-TANF subgroup”)**. This subgroup consisted of non-ABAWD individuals who did not receive TANF cash assistance at any time during the 12 months preceding their food stamp exit. This includes families whose incomes were too high to qualify for TANF cash assistance, single individuals or childless couples over 50 years old, or the disabled.

The decomposition of the universe into these three subgroups reflects both the special interest in those subject to the ABAWD time limit and the presumption that, among non-ABAWDs, those with and those without prior TANF receipt constitute two very different subpopulations. Those who received TANF cash assistance in the prior year are a lower income subgroup and may be more likely to have experienced hardship upon leaving food stamps.⁸

As noted earlier, this study focuses on food stamp exiters in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA, which consists of Maricopa and Pinal Counties. This study area was selected to meet two requirements of this research. The first requirement was that the study be conducted in geographical areas without ABAWD time-limit waivers. As noted above, Maricopa and Pinal are among four Arizona counties that have no such waiver (except for the high-unemployment reservation areas within their boundaries). The second requirement was that the study include “a nonmetropolitan area with historically high poverty rates.” Pinal County has no city of more than 25,000 residents; its 1992 population density was only 22 persons per square mile (compared to a statewide average of 34 and a nationwide average of 72); and the percentage of persons with incomes below the poverty level in 1989 was 23.6 percent (compared to a statewide average of 15.7 percent and a nationwide average of 13.1 percent).⁹

Exhibit 1-3 shows the count of food stamp exiters in calendar year 1997, as distributed by geographic area and by subgroup, not including exempt ABAWD exiters. Counts are shown for adult and child exiters combined in the upper panel, for adult exiters only in the middle panel, and for cases with any adult or child exiter in the lower panel. (Adults are defined here as those 18 years or older.) There were 311,082 exiters statewide, including all adults and children who left the program for a period of at least two consecutive months during 1997. More than half of these (172,114 or 55 percent) were in the Phoenix-Mesa area. The Phoenix-Mesa area also accounted for more than half of the adult exiters (79,308 of 143,836) and more than half of the cases with exiters (82,453 of 144,770).

The count of adult exiters in the Phoenix-Mesa area is important, as it established the sampling frame for the survey. Because all ABAWD exiters are at least 18 years of age, the count of adult exiters for each ABAWD cell equals the total count of exiters for that cell. In each of the two non-ABAWD subgroups, however, more than half of the exiters were minors.

The count of “cases with any adult or child exiter” is shown because this is the accounting unit for outcomes pertaining to income sources such as child support, child care, and emergency assistance. Note that, for ABAWDs and for the non-TANF subgroup, the count of cases is somewhat lower than

8 Unless otherwise noted, the term “cash assistance” in this report refers to TANF cash assistance, versus general assistance, emergency assistance, or other forms of cash benefits.

9 U.S. Bureau of the Census, *County and City Data Book: 1994*, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994.

the corresponding count of adult exiters. This reflects, for instance, childless couples among these subgroups. In contrast, for the TANF subgroup, the count of cases exceeds the count of adult exiters. This reflects the fact that a substantial number of exiting food stamp cases have no active adult member, as would occur in instances where the parent had previously been removed from the food stamp household because of noncompliance with work requirements or child support requirements.

Exhibit 1-3

Distribution of Arizona Food Stamp Exiters, by Subgroup and Area, 1997

| Area | ABAWD Exiters | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total |
|---|------------------|-------------------|----------|---------|
| | | TANF | Non-TANF | |
| Number of adult and child exiters | | | | |
| Phoenix-Mesa MSA ^a | 16,276 | 70,605 | 85,233 | 172,114 |
| All other areas | 8,858 | 50,332 | 79,778 | 138,968 |
| Statewide total | 25,134 | 120,937 | 165,011 | 311,082 |
| Number of adult exiters | | | | |
| Phoenix-Mesa MSA ^a | 16,276 | 25,040 | 37,992 | 79,308 |
| All other areas | 8,858 | 19,357 | 36,313 | 64,528 |
| Statewide total | 25,134 | 44,397 | 74,305 | 143,836 |
| Number of cases with any adult or child exiter | | | | |
| Phoenix-Mesa MSA ^a | 15,454 | 29,305 | 37,694 | 82,453 |
| All other areas | 8,438 | 21,005 | 32,874 | 62,317 |
| Statewide total | 23,892 | 50,310 | 70,568 | 144,770 |

a Phoenix-Mesa MSA includes Maricopa and Pinal Counties.

Sources: ADES, administrative data.

1.3 Data Sources

This section describes the administrative data and survey data that were collected for this study.

Administrative Data

Relevant administrative data for the universe of 1997 food stamp exiters in the Phoenix-Mesa area were compiled from the automated program files of the Arizona Department of Economic Security (ADES). Identifying information on these individuals (e.g., case identification number, client number, and/or social security number) was used to link with other state databases and to extract the data needed for the analysis of food stamp exiters. File extracts were prepared for each of the following types of administrative data:

- cash assistance receipt, food stamp receipt, and Medicaid eligibility,
- JOBS participation and activities,
- child care assistance,
- child support payments,
- child welfare,
- emergency assistance, and
- wages reported through the state’s unemployment insurance system.

These files covered the period January 1997 through March 1999.

For purposes of analysis, the administrative data were aligned to enable measurement of outcomes over comparable elapsed intervals, starting with the month of exit (defined as “month 0”). For those who left food stamps in January 1997, the first “exit cohort,” the administrative data allowed for the measurement of follow-up outcomes over a period of 8 complete quarters. For those in the last exit cohort, who left food stamps in December 1997, we had 15 months, or five complete quarters of follow-up data.

Exhibit 1-4 shows in greater detail the length of the observed follow-up period for each monthly exit cohort. The exit quarter is numbered “quarter 0.” As the exhibit illustrates, all exiters were observed over a minimum of five follow-up quarters. As one proceeds through longer follow-up intervals—that is, through quarters 6, 7, and 8—there is the increasing potential for selectivity bias, as the findings come to reflect a progressively smaller and earlier set of exiters. For this reason, the findings cited in this report pertain to quarters 1 through 5.

For the three subgroups of exiters under study—ABAWD, TANF, and non-TANF—Exhibit 1-5 shows the number of observations on which the administratively-reported findings are based. This is shown both for adult exiters and for cases with any adult or child exiter.

Exhibit 1-4

Length of Observed Follow-up Period, by Exit Cohort

| Month of Food Stamp Exit ^a | Number of Follow-up Months | Number of Follow-up Quarters | Sequencing of exit quarter (quarter 0) and follow-up quarters | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| | | | Jan - Mar 1997 | Apr - Jun 1997 | Jul - Sep 1997 | Oct - Dec 1997 | Jan - Mar 1998 | Apr - Jun 1998 | Jul - Sep 1998 | Oct - Dec 1998 | Jan - Mar 1999 | | | |
| January 1997 | 26 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | | |
| February 1997 | 25 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | | |
| March 1997 | 24 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | | |
| April 1997 | 23 | 7 | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | |
| May 1997 | 22 | 7 | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | |
| June 1997 | 21 | 7 | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | |
| July 1997 | 20 | 6 | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | |
| August 1997 | 19 | 6 | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | |
| September 1997 | 18 | 6 | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | |
| October 1997 | 17 | 5 | | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| November 1997 | 16 | 5 | | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| December 1997 | 15 | 5 | | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |

^a For each food stamp exiter, the indicated month is the first month of a minimum two-month exit from food stamps. For example, those in the January 1997 exit cohort received food stamps in December 1996, but then did not receive food stamps in either January or February 1997. Those in the December 1997 exit cohort received food stamps in November 1997, but in neither December 1997 nor January 1998.

Exhibit 1-5**Number of Available Observations for Administratively-Reported Outcomes, Phoenix-Mesa Area**

| | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | | Total |
|--|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exiters | TANF | Non-TANF | |
| Number of observations for quarters 1 through 5: | | | | |
| Adult exiters | 16,276 | 25,040 | 37,992 | 79,308 |
| Cases with any adult or child exiter | 15,454 | 29,305 | 37,694 | 82,453 |

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Survey Data

To address important post-exit outcomes not available through administrative data, a survey was conducted on a sample of the food stamp exiters in the Phoenix-Mesa area. During May through October 1999, a total of 696 individuals were interviewed: 90 in the ABAWD subgroup, 322 in the TANF subgroup, and 284 in the non-TANF subgroup. Of the 696 interviews, 389 were completed by telephone interviewer, and 307 were completed by field interviewer. The overall response rate for the survey was 54 percent. Exhibit 1-6 shows the disposition of cases in the total survey sample of 1,306. The sample was a stratified random sample of adult exiters, with 240 in the ABAWD subgroup, 533 in the TANF subgroup, and 533 in the non-TANF subgroup.¹⁰

As shown in Appendix A, the survey instrument contained questions on the following topics:

- food stamp benefits,
- household composition and child care,
- employment,
- employment benefits and health insurance,
- education and training,
- household income,
- family well-being and support, and
- food security.

¹⁰ Note that, if several persons from the same exiting food stamp household were selected into the survey sample, all were separately interviewed. This allowed the study to capture possible variation in the subsequent experience of multiple individuals (possibly ABAWDs) who belonged to the same recipient household and lost their eligibility.

Exhibit 1-6**Disposition of Survey Sample**

| Follow-up Period | ABAWD Exiters | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total |
|---|---------------|-------------------|----------|-------|
| | | TANF | Non-TANF | |
| Total survey sample | 240 | 533 | 533 | 1,306 |
| Found not eligible for interview | | | | |
| Deceased | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| SSN check failed | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Never received food stamps | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 1 | 2 | 19 | 22 |
| Presumed eligible for interview | 239 | 531 | 514 | 1,284 |
| Disposition of those presumed eligible for interview | | | | |
| Unable to locate | 119 | 171 | 170 | 460 |
| Located but not interviewed | | | | |
| Unable to arrange appointment | 22 | 34 | 45 | 101 |
| Refusal or breakoff | 8 | 3 | 10 | 21 |
| Language barrier | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Subtotal | 30 | 38 | 60 | 128 |
| Interviews completed | | | | |
| By telephone interviewer | 44 | 175 | 170 | 389 |
| By field interviewer | 46 | 147 | 114 | 307 |
| Total | 90 | 322 | 284 | 696 |
| Response rate | | | | |
| Interviews completed as a percentage of those presumed eligible for interview | 37.7% | 60.6% | 55.3% | 54.2% |

The questions on the final topic, food security, comprised the 18-item Food Security Module (with a 12-month time reference), as developed by USDA's Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) and as now regularly administered as a supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS).

The survey was conducted using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) and personal interviewing (CAPI). A pretest of the instrument was conducted on March 17, 1999. Tracking letters were mailed to all members of the survey sample, informing them of the upcoming survey and requesting updated address and telephone information. Additional tracking efforts included directory assistance requests, postal update requests, and credit agency and other third party searches. Telephone interviewing began on May 17, 1999, and the field interviewing effort commenced on June 23, 1999. Interviewing was completed on October 3, 1999. All respondents were provided an incentive payment of \$20.

On a regular monthly basis, ADES provided information from the Arizona Technical Eligibility Computer System (AZTECS), containing updated locating information on the entire survey sample. From the outset of the survey, however, it was evident that the administratively-available information on respondent addresses and telephone numbers was of limited use, especially for members of the ABAWD subgroup. For a substantial number of ABAWD members, the last known address was one of several homeless shelters or mail pick-up locations used by homeless persons. Many were no longer receiving any ADES-administered services; some had not received any such services since the time of their food stamp exit, a period of more than two years for those in the earliest exit cohorts.

For the ABAWD subgroup, extensive locating efforts were undertaken. Contact was established with the directors of all major Phoenix-area homeless shelters, including Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS), the city's largest shelter. Assistance was also sought and received from the coordinator for homeless program services for the city of Phoenix, from client advocates for the homeless population, and from staff specialists in the Phoenix Housing Authority and ADES. To facilitate requests to local post offices for updated address information on sample members, a letter addressed to local postmasters was obtained from the ADES Assistant Director for the Division of Benefits and Medicaid Eligibility. Despite these efforts, we were unable to locate fully one-half of the ABAWD sample members (119 of 240).

As shown in Exhibit 1-6, the overall survey response rate of 54 percent resulted from response rates by subgroup, as follows: 38 percent for the ABAWD subgroup, 61 percent for the TANF subgroup, and 55 percent for the non-TANF subgroup. These response rates are a lower-bound calculation, as they reflect the most conservative assumptions regarding those not located and those located but not interviewed to completion. In particular, all of these individuals are presumed to have been eligible for interview; they all thus enter the denominator of the response rate calculation. Moreover, those partially interviewed did not enter the numerator. We have thus adopted the "minimum response rate" definition established by the American Association for Public Opinion Research in its standards.¹¹

11 See American Association for Public Opinion Research, "Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for RDD Telephone Surveys and In-Person Household Surveys," Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1998. (Available on the AAPOR website: www.aapor.org/ethics/stddef.html.)

To address the issue of potential nonresponse bias in the survey data, we first used the state's administrative data to compare the survey respondents in each subgroup with the corresponding universe of food stamp exiters, in terms of basic demographic characteristics, their exit reason, and the length of their food stamp spell prior to exit.¹² The selected demographic attributes were gender, age, race/ethnicity, and citizenship. These comparisons are shown in Exhibit 1-7 for the ABAWD subgroup, Exhibit 1-8 for the TANF subgroup, and Exhibit 1-9 for the non-TANF subgroup. Within each subgroup, a test was conducted on each selected attribute, to establish whether the difference between the survey respondents and the corresponding universe was statistically significant (at the 0.10 level or better).

This comparative profiling of survey respondents supports the following conclusions regarding the potential for nonresponse bias:

- **ABAWD subgroup.** With respect to age, the distribution of respondents was significantly different from that of the corresponding universe of exiters. Respondents were disproportionately older than the universe. Respondents were less likely to have exited for residence-related reasons and were more likely to have been long-term food stamp recipients prior to exit.
- **TANF subgroup.** In contrast, for this subgroup the characteristics of respondents differed significantly from those of the universe for all tested attributes except gender. Compared to their associated universe, respondents were disproportionately older, Hispanic, non-U.S. citizens, procedurally-related exiters, and longer term recipients prior to exit.
- **Non-TANF subgroup.** For this subgroup the differences between respondents and the universe were significant for all tested attributes. Respondents were disproportionately male, older, Hispanic, non-U.S. citizens, exiters for failure to meet categorical eligibility requirements, and longer-term recipients prior to exit.

We also investigated the presence of nonresponse bias using the state's quarterly unemployment insurance (UI) wage files. Such administratively-reported employment information was available for the entire survey universe in each of the three subgroups of exiters.¹³ We tabulated quarter-by-quarter outcomes with respect to both the employment rate and the average quarterly earnings amount. (The calculation of average earnings included both those with and those without reported earnings.) The findings for the three subgroups are shown in Exhibit 1-10 for the exit quarter (quarter 0) and the last follow-up quarter (quarter 5) observed for all members of the universe.

12 As to the reason for food stamp exit, we used the coded reason in the state's administrative files to construct the following five major categories: failure to meet financial eligibility requirements, failure to meet categorical eligibility requirements, failure to meet residence requirements, failure to comply with procedural or other requirements, and overdue recertification. Appendix B indicates the manner in which the reason codes that appear in the administrative data were grouped into these categories.

13 For each subgroup, there were small numbers of exiters for which a valid Social Security number did not exist in the administrative data. For such individuals, it was not possible to establish whether the UI data files contained any corresponding record of quarter-by-quarter earnings. The estimates discussed here reflect only those exiters with a valid Social Security number.

For the ABAWD survey respondents, the extent of covered employment in quarter 5 was significantly higher than in the corresponding universe, with respect to both the employment rate and the average quarterly earnings amount. This suggests that, in conducting the survey, interviewers were more likely to locate and successfully interview those ABAWDs with a steadier attachment to the labor force and thus with a more stable living situation.

In contrast, the two non-ABAWD subgroups showed significantly lower exit-quarter employment rates than in the corresponding universe. By quarter 5, however, these differences were no longer statistically significant; nor were there significant universe-respondent differences in average earnings amounts in quarter 5 for these two subgroups.

The survey findings should thus be interpreted cautiously for the ABAWD subgroup. Specifically, the ABAWD survey respondents appear to be disproportionately better off than the members of this subgroup at large. This implies, for instance, that the degree of hardship reported by the ABAWD survey respondents may understate the degree of hardship experienced more generally within the universe of ABAWD exiters for the geographic area and time period under study here.

1.4 Organization of This Report

The following chapters of this report present the findings of the analysis of administratively-reported outcomes and survey-reported outcomes. Chapter 2 discusses the major administratively-reported outcomes: program participation, employment, and income. Chapter 3 addresses survey-reported employment, health insurance, and income. Chapter 4 examines the survey-reported outcomes pertaining to living and child care arrangements. Chapter 5 focuses on survey-reported measures of economic security. Chapter 6 is a concluding assessment.

Exhibit 1-7**Exit Characteristics of Survey Universe and Respondents: ABAWD Subgroup**

| Characteristic | Universe (16,276) | Respondents (90) | See note. |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Gender (%) | | | |
| Male | 70.9% | 70.0% | |
| Female | 29.1 | 30.0 | |
| Age (%) | | | |
| 29 years or younger | 39.7 | 24.4 | *** |
| 30 to 49 years | 58.6 | 72.2 | *** |
| 50 to 59 years | 1.8 | 3.3 | |
| Race/ethnicity (%) | | | |
| White | 53.5 | 51.1 | |
| African American | 15.3 | 21.1 | |
| American Indian | 6.0 | 4.4 | |
| Hispanic | 22.2 | 20.0 | |
| Other | 3.0 | 3.3 | |
| Citizenship (%) | | | |
| U.S. | 91.0 | 88.9 | |
| Other | 9.0 | 11.1 | |
| Reason for food stamp exit(%) | | | |
| Failure to meet: | | | |
| Financial eligibility requirements | 6.9 | 8.9 | |
| Categorical eligibility requirements | 3.2 | 5.6 | |
| Residence requirements | 4.6 | 0.0 | ** |
| Procedural or other requirements | 30.4 | 28.9 | |
| Overdue recertification | 54.9 | 56.7 | |
| Length of food stamp spell prior to exit (%) | | | |
| 1 to 5 months | 81.2 | 81.1 | |
| 6 to 11 months | 10.2 | 6.7 | |
| 12 to 23 months | 5.0 | 4.4 | |
| 24 or more months | 3.6 | 7.7 | |

Source: ADES administrative data and Abt Associates survey.

Note: Asterisks indicate that respondents differ from the corresponding universe at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 1-8**Exit Characteristics of Survey Universe and Respondents: TANF Subgroup**

| Characteristic | Universe (16,276) | Respondents (90) | See note. |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Gender (%) | | | |
| Male | 12.9% | 15.5% | |
| Female | 87.1 | 84.5 | |
| Age (%) | | | |
| 29 years or younger | 55.4 | 46.6 | *** |
| 30 to 49 years | 42.7 | 48.4 | ** |
| 50 to 59 years | 1.8 | 4.4 | *** |
| 60 years or older | 0.1 | 0.6 | *** |
| Race/ethnicity (%) | | | |
| White | 45.9 | 34.2 | *** |
| African American | 12.6 | 14.9 | |
| American Indian | 6.7 | 4.4 | |
| Hispanic | 33.2 | 42.9 | *** |
| Other | 1.6 | 2.2 | |
| Citizenship (%) | | | |
| U.S. | 91.7 | 81.1 | *** |
| Other | 8.3 | 18.9 | *** |
| Reason for food stamp exit(%) | | | |
| Failure to meet: | | | |
| Financial eligibility requirements | 9.6 | 7.9 | |
| Categorical eligibility requirements | 3.4 | 6.5 | *** |
| Residence requirements | 4.6 | 2.8 | |
| Procedural or other requirements | 45.5 | 61.2 | *** |
| Overdue recertification | 36.9 | 22.4 | *** |
| Length of food stamp spell prior to exit (%) | | | |
| 1 to 5 months | 51.8 | 45.0 | ** |
| 6 to 11 months | 24.2 | 25.8 | |
| 12 to 23 months | 14.5 | 15.2 | |
| 24 or more months | 9.5 | 14.0 | *** |

Source: ADES administrative data and Abt Associates survey.

Note: Asterisks indicate that respondents differ from the corresponding universe at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 1-9**Exit Characteristics of Survey Universe and Respondents: Non-TANF Subgroup**

| Characteristic | Universe (37,992) | Respondents (284) | See note. |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Gender (%) | | | |
| Male | 38.7% | 44.7% | ** |
| Female | 61.3 | 55.3 | ** |
| Age (%) | | | |
| 29 years or younger | 34.0 | 25.9 | *** |
| 30 to 49 years | 43.2 | 37.2 | ** |
| 50 to 59 years | 12.9 | 16.8 | ** |
| 60 years or older | 9.9 | 20.1 | *** |
| Race/ethnicity (%) | | | |
| White | 50.5 | 46.5 | |
| African American | 8.2 | 7.0 | |
| American Indian | 5.7 | 2.1 | *** |
| Hispanic | 32.4 | 40.8 | *** |
| Other | 3.2 | 3.5 | |
| Citizenship (%) | | | |
| U.S. | 85.0 | 75.4 | *** |
| Other | 15.0 | 24.6 | *** |
| Reason for food stamp exit(%) | | | |
| Failure to meet: | | | |
| Financial eligibility requirements | 14.3 | 14.1 | |
| Categorical eligibility requirements | 5.0 | 8.5 | *** |
| Residence requirements | 3.5 | 1.1 | ** |
| Procedural or other requirements | 31.4 | 31.3 | |
| Overdue recertification | 45.8 | 45.1 | |
| Length of food stamp spell prior to exit (%) | | | |
| 1 to 5 months | 58.1 | 48.2 | *** |
| 6 to 11 months | 18.4 | 19.7 | |
| 12 to 23 months | 12.4 | 13.0 | |
| 24 or more months | 11.1 | 19.0 | *** |

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Note: Asterisks indicate that respondents differ from the corresponding universe at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 1-10

Administratively Reported Employment Status of Survey Universe and Respondents, by Subgroup

| Follow-up Period | ABAWD Exiters | | TANF | | Non-ABAWD Exiters | |
|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Universe (16,276) | Respondents (90) | Universe (25,040) | Respondents (322) | Universe (25,040) | Respondents (322) |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 55.7 | 62.2 | 53.5 | 43.3 *** | 52.0 | 45.3 *** |
| Quarter 5 | 46.9 | 62.2 *** | 52.6 | 53.6 | 47.5 | 47.8 |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 1,167 | 1,360 | 1,219 | 905 *** | 1,483 | 1,308 |
| Quarter 5 | 1,411 | 1,780 * | 1,550 | 1,459 | 1,700 | 1,710 |

Percent in covered employment at any time during indicated period (%)

Average quarterly earnings during indicated period (\$)

Note: Asterisks indicate that respondents differ from the corresponding universe at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Chapter 2

Administratively-Reported Outcomes

This chapter presents findings on the post-exit status of food stamp exiters as reflected in administrative data. Three major categories of outcomes are examined: participation of adult exiters in food stamps, cash assistance, Medicaid, and JOBS; employment of adult exiters; and household-level outcomes.

Post-exit findings are displayed in a consistent format. For each subgroup under study (ABAWD, TANF, and non-TANF) and for the weighted total of the three subgroups combined, the mean of each outcome is tabulated by follow-up quarter: for quarter 0 (the exit quarter), for each individual quarter 1 through 5, and for quarters 1 through 5 combined. Recall that all exiters were observed in the data through follow-up quarter 5. Because these findings are based on the entire universe of exiters for each defined subgroup, tests of the statistical significance of differences between subgroups are not relevant in this chapter.

The key findings with respect to administratively-reported outcomes are as follows:

- Among adult exiters in the three subgroups under study, those in the TANF subgroup experienced the highest rates of post-exit participation in food stamps, cash assistance, Medicaid, and JOBS. More than one-third (35 percent) of the TANF subgroup returned to food stamps within five quarters of their exit.
- The adult exiters in the TANF subgroup experienced the highest rates of employment in jobs covered by unemployment insurance, compared to the other subgroups. In each of the first five follow-up quarters, more than one-half (53 percent) of the TANF exiters were so employed. For each of the other two subgroups, the employment rates in each quarter were two to six percentage points lower than those for the TANF subgroup. Nearly three-quarters (73 percent) of the TANF exiters were employed at some time during the five-quarter follow-up period.
- For average quarterly earnings in covered employment among adult exiters, the TANF subgroup showed the largest increase between the exit quarter and quarter 5, in both absolute and proportional terms. In each quarter, it was the non-TANF subgroup that experienced the highest level of quarterly earnings in covered employment among the three subgroups, reaching \$1,700 by follow-up quarter 5.
- In terms of household-level outcomes, it was again the TANF subgroup that experienced the highest levels of program involvement. The percentage of cases in this subgroup who availed themselves of program support at some point during the first five follow-up quarters was as follows: 14 percent for child support payments, 16 percent for child care assistance, 5 percent for emergency assistance, and 5 percent for child welfare services.

- For combined administratively-reported income (consisting of food stamps, cash assistance, earnings, child support payments, child care assistance, and emergency assistance, aggregated to the household level), the ABAWD subgroup experienced the highest proportional increase (17 percent) between the exit quarter and follow-up quarter 5, followed by the non-TANF subgroup (14 percent) and the TANF subgroup (11 percent). Note, however, that the income growth in the non-ABAWD subgroups was influenced by the number of child-only cases in each of these subgroups.

2.1 Program Participation of Adult Exiters

This section discusses the status of adult food stamp exiters at the time of their exit and following their exit, with respect to food stamps, cash assistance, Medicaid, and the JOBS program.

Program Status at Exit

Exhibit 2-1 first shows the food stamp status of adult exiters when they left food stamps. ABAWD exiters had received food stamps for an average of 5.4 months. For the two non-ABAWD subgroups, the mean length of spell was about twice as long (10.6 months for the TANF subgroup and 10.9 months for the non-TANF subgroup). The average household food stamp benefit was highest for the TANF subgroup (\$155).

Among the three subgroups, the TANF subgroup showed the highest level of participation in both cash assistance and Medicaid in the month prior to their food stamp exit. Approximately two-thirds (65 percent) of TANF exiters received cash assistance in this month, with an average monthly case benefit of \$124. (By definition, all members of this subgroup received cash assistance at some time during the 12 months prior to the exit.) More than three-fourths (76 percent) of this subgroup participated in Medicaid at the time of food stamp exit.

Receipt of Food Stamps

Food stamp recidivism is shown in Exhibit 2-2. Note that about two-thirds of the adult exiters in each subgroup received food stamps during the exit quarter. One expects this outcome, as the exit month is equally likely to fall in the first, second, or third month of the exit quarter. If it falls in the second or third month, the exiter will have received food stamps during the exit quarter. If the exit month falls in the first month, the exiter will not have received food stamps in the exit quarter, unless they re-enter the program in the third month.

Exhibit 2-1**Program Status at Exit**

| | ABAWD Exiters (16,276) | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (79,308) |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (25,040) | Non-TANF (37,992) | |
| Food stamp status | | | | |
| Length of food stamp spell prior to exit (months) | 5.4 | 10.6 | 10.9 | 9.7 |
| Case benefit in month prior to exit | \$73 | \$155 | \$111 | \$117 |
| Cash assistance status | | | | |
| Received TANF cash assistance in month prior to exit (%) | 0.3% | 65.1% | 2.0% ^a | 21.6% |
| Case benefit in month prior to exit | \$1 | \$124 | \$7 | \$43 |
| Medicaid status | | | | |
| Participated in Medicaid in month prior to exit (%) | 1.6% | 75.6% | 14.8% | 31.3% |

Base: Adult food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

a A small number of non-TANF exiters received cash assistance in the first month of the two-month absence from food stamps that established them as an exiter.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Exhibit 2-2**Receipt of Food Stamps**

| Follow-up Period | ABAWD Exitters (16,276) | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | Total (79,308) |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (25,040) | Non-TANF (37,992) | |
| | | Percentage receiving food stamps at any time during indicated period | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 63.0% | 64.0% | 65.9% | 64.7% |
| Quarter 1 | 1.8 | 12.2 | 6.6 | 7.4 |
| Quarter 2 | 3.4 | 19.9 | 11.4 | 12.4 |
| Quarter 3 | 3.9 | 21.5 | 13.2 | 13.9 |
| Quarter 4 | 3.4 | 20.6 | 12.9 | 13.4 |
| Quarter 5 | 4.5 | 22.6 | 14.9 | 15.2 |
| Quarters 1 through 5a | 8.5 | 35.3 | 23.5 | 24.1 |

Base: Adult food stamp exitters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

The recidivism rate was greatest for the TANF subgroup, with 35 percent returning to food stamps at some time during quarters 1 through 5. This compares to 24 percent for the non-TANF subgroup and 9 percent for the ABAWD subgroup.

Receipt of Cash Assistance

The receipt of cash assistance following the food stamp exit was also greater among the TANF subgroup than the other two subgroups. As shown in Exhibit 2-3, 29 percent of the TANF subgroup received cash assistance at some time during quarters 1 through 5, versus 6 percent for the non-TANF subgroup and less than 1 percent for the ABAWD subgroup. (In some few instances, ABAWD exitters thus had child dependents either before or after their food stamp exit or were members of households that included others' children.)

Exhibit 2-3**Receipt of Cash Assistance**

| Follow-up Period | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (79,308) |
|----------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (16,276) | TANF (25,040) | Non-TANF (37,992) | |
| | Percentage receiving cash assistance at any time during indicated period | | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 0.3% | 51.4% | 2.2% ^a | 17.3% |
| Quarter 1 | 0.2 | 15.7 | 2.2 | 6.1 |
| Quarter 2 | 0.2 | 15.4 | 2.9 | 6.3 |
| Quarter 3 | 0.2 | 14.4 | 3.0 | 6.0 |
| Quarter 4 | 0.2 | 11.7 | 2.6 | 5.0 |
| Quarter 5 | 0.2 | 12.8 | 2.9 | 5.5 |
| Quarters 1 through 5 | 0.4 | 29.4 | 5.8 | 12.1 |

a A small number of non-TANF exitters received cash assistance in the month immediately following their food stamp exit, within the same calendar quarter.

Base: Adult food stamp exitters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Participation in Medicaid

Compared to the other two subgroups, the TANF subgroup also experienced a higher rate of post-exit Medicaid participation. Exhibit 2-4 shows that nearly one-half (49 percent) of those in the TANF subgroup participated in Medicaid at some time during follow-up quarters 1 through 5. The corresponding rate was 18 percent for the non-TANF subgroup and 2 percent for the ABAWD subgroup. Note that, for the TANF subgroup, Medicaid would have been an entitlement while receiving cash assistance and for two years following a termination of cash assistance related to employment.

Exhibit 2-4**Participation in Medicaid**

| Follow-up Period | ABAWD Exitters (16,276) | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | Total (79,308) |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (25,040) | Non-TANF (37,992) | |
| Percentage participating in Medicaid at any time during indicated period | | | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 1.8% | 66.1% | 15.4% | 28.6% |
| Quarter 1 | 1.2 | 30.6 | 10.9 | 15.1 |
| Quarter 2 | 1.1 | 28.6 | 9.2 | 13.7 |
| Quarter 3 | 1.0 | 27.6 | 9.1 | 13.3 |
| Quarter 4 | 0.9 | 24.9 | 8.6 | 12.2 |
| Quarter 5 | 1.2 | 26.9 | 9.2 | 13.1 |
| Quarters 1 through 5 | 2.3 | 49.4 | 18.4 | 24.9 |

Base: Adult food stamp exitters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Participation in JOBS

As with the outcomes discussed above, participation in the JOBS program was higher among adult exitters in the TANF subgroup than in the other two subgroups (see Exhibit 2-5). This outcome is measured not by follow-up quarter, but for the entire follow-up period through March 1999. For the TANF subgroup, 16 percent participated in some JOBS program component at some time during the follow-up interval. This was so for 3 percent in the non-TANF subgroup and less than 1 percent in the ABAWD subgroup. Assessment and job search were the most prevalent forms of JOBS activity.

Exhibit 2-5**Participation in JOBS**

| JOBS Program Activity | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (79,308) |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (16,276) | TANF (25,040) | Non-TANF (37,992) | |
| | Percentage participating in post-exit JOBS activity at any time through March 1999 | | | |
| Assessment | 0.2% | 10.6% | 2.3% | 4.5% |
| Community service | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Community work experience | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| English as a second language | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| General equivalence diploma (GED) | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Job search | 0.2 | 8.7 | 1.8 | 3.6 |
| Job placement | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Postsecondary education | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Job readiness | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Subsidized employment | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Unpaid work experience | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Employment and training | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Paid work | 0.3 | 5.7 | 1.2 | 2.4 |
| Any JOBS program activity ^a | 0.6 | 15.9 | 3.4 | 6.8 |

Base: Adult food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

a Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the total because individuals may have participated in more than one activity.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

2.2 Employment of Adult Exitters

This section describes the pattern of post-exit outcomes with respect to employment in jobs covered by unemployment insurance (UI). Such employment is reflected in reports that employers file quarterly through the state's UI wage reporting system. Such reporting does not capture earnings from self-employment, federal employment, and many forms of casual or seasonal employment. Later in this report, findings are presented on the extent of paid employment as reported through the survey of exiters. Those findings include both covered and uncovered employment.

Covered Employment

As shown in Exhibit 2-6, more than one-half of the adult exiters in each subgroup were employed in the quarter of their food stamp exit. The percentage was highest for the ABAWD subgroup, at 56 percent.

Exhibit 2-6

Covered Employment

| Follow-up Period | ABAWD Exiters (16,276) | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (79,308) |
|----------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (25,040) | Non-TANF (37,992) | |
| | Percentage in covered employment at any time during indicated period | | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 55.7% | 53.5% | 52.0% | 53.2% |
| Quarter 1 | 51.7 | 53.4 | 50.6 | 51.7 |
| Quarter 2 | 49.8 | 53.3 | 49.7 | 50.9 |
| Quarter 3 | 49.2 | 53.3 | 48.9 | 50.3 |
| Quarter 4 | 47.8 | 52.7 | 48.4 | 49.6 |
| Quarter 5 | 46.9 | 52.6 | 47.5 | 49.0 |
| Quarters 1 through 5 | 66.8 | 72.5 | 63.0 | 66.8 |

Base: Adult food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

By the time of the fifth follow-up quarter, however, the percentage in covered employment declined slightly in the ABAWD and non-TANF subgroups, to below 48 percent. The percentage employed in the TANF subgroup remained constant at 53 percent.

For each subgroup, there was movement of workers in and out of employment. This is indicated by the higher percentages of exiters who were employed at some time during follow-up quarters 1 through 5 than during any individual quarter. This percentage was highest for the TANF subgroup, at 73 percent.

Earnings from Covered Employment

Even though the percentage employed quarterly in each subgroup did not rise during the observed follow-up period, the average amount of quarterly earnings did show an increase in all subgroups. For those employed, either average weekly hours or the average hourly wages (or both) may have increased over time. Alternatively, the mix of employed exiters may have shifted over time to those working longer hours or at higher wages (or both).

Exhibit 2-7 indicates that between the exit quarter and follow-up quarter 5, the TANF subgroup experienced the greatest increase in average quarterly earnings, in both absolute terms (from \$1,219 to \$1,550) and proportional terms (by 27 percent). The corresponding proportional increases were 21 percent for the ABAWD subgroup (from \$1,167 to \$1,411) and 15 percent for the non-TANF subgroup (from \$1,483 to \$1,700). Note that in every quarter it was the non-TANF subgroup that showed the highest level of average covered earnings.

Exhibit 2-7

Earnings from Covered Employment

| Follow-up Period | ABAWD Exiters (16,276) | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (79,308) |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (25,040) | Non-TANF (37,992) | |
| | | Average quarterly earnings during indicated period | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | \$1,167 | \$1,219 | \$1,483 | \$1,334 |
| Quarter 1 | 1,276 | 1,342 | 1,580 | 1,442 |
| Quarter 2 | 1,303 | 1,390 | 1,606 | 1,476 |
| Quarter 3 | 1,356 | 1,461 | 1,640 | 1,525 |
| Quarter 4 | 1,385 | 1,510 | 1,676 | 1,564 |
| Quarter 5 | 1,411 | 1,550 | 1,700 | 1,593 |
| Quarters 1 through 5 | 1,346 | 1,451 | 1,641 | 1,520 |

Base: Adult food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

2.3 Household-Level Outcomes

Administrative data enable an accounting of program benefits and income at the household level. This section presents findings with respect to child support payments, child care assistance, emergency assistance, child welfare, and combined administratively-reported income.

Note that these outcomes are measured at the case level. A case is defined as all those individuals who share the same agency-assigned case number as the identified adult or child food stamp exiter. As noted in Chapter 1, the number of cases is somewhat lower than the number of adult exiters for the ABAWD and non-TANF subgroups; this results from the number of single-member households, unrelated individuals, or childless couples in these subgroups. In contrast, the TANF subgroup shows a higher number of cases than adult exiters, resulting from situations in which all case members at the time of food stamp exit were children. The latter situations would occur, for instance, if a parent had been disqualified from food stamps (prior to 1997) for having failed to comply with work requirements, child support requirements, or other procedural rules. If the entire case then left food stamps during 1997, the exiting members would all be children.

In the tabulation of family-related outcomes, the ABAWD subgroup is included. Although none of these exiters had dependents themselves at the time of exit, some may have belonged to cases with children (e.g., their grandchildren, nieces or nephews, or others' children), at exit or subsequently.

Child Support Payments

Only a small percentage of exiting cases received child support payments during the observed follow-up quarters. As shown in Exhibit 2-8, the percentage was highest among the TANF subgroup, where 14 percent of cases received child support payments at some time during quarters 1 through 5. This compared to 6 percent for the non-TANF subgroup and 2 percent for the ABAWD subgroup. For each of the three subgroups, the quarter-by-quarter trend was consistently downward through quarter 5.

Child Care Assistance

The pattern of receipt of child care assistance, shown in Exhibit 2-9, closely resembled that noted above for child support payments. That is, for each subgroup a small percentage of cases received child care assistance, with the TANF subgroup showing a higher percentage than the other two subgroups. Unlike the pattern for child support, the percentage receiving child care assistance in each subgroup remained roughly constant in each observed quarter.

Emergency Assistance

The percentage of cases receiving emergency assistance was very small in all three subgroups, as indicated in Exhibit 2-10. Such assistance included the Low-Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and other cash payments for short-term emergencies. The percentage of cases receiving such assistance at any time through follow-up quarter 5 was 5 percent for the TANF subgroup, 4 percent for the non-TANF subgroup, and 2 percent for the ABAWD subgroup.

Exhibit 2-8**Receipt of Child Support**

| Follow-up Period | Cases with ABAWD Exiters (15,454) | Cases with Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (82,453) |
|--|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (29,305) | Non-TANF (37,694) | |
| Percentage of cases receiving child support at any time during indicated period | | | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 1.2% | 8.7% | 3.8% | 5.1% |
| Quarter 1 | 1.1 | 8.5 | 3.7 | 4.9 |
| Quarter 2 | 1.1 | 8.4 | 3.7 | 4.9 |
| Quarter 3 | 1.1 | 7.9 | 3.5 | 4.6 |
| Quarter 4 | 0.9 | 7.2 | 3.0 | 4.1 |
| Quarter 5 | 0.8 | 6.3 | 2.5 | 3.5 |
| Quarters 1 through 5 | 1.9 | 14.3 | 6.1 | 8.2 |

Base: Cases with any adult or child food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Exhibit 2-9**Receipt of Child Care Assistance**

| Follow-up Period | Cases with ABAWD Exiters (15,454) | Cases with Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (82,453) |
|--|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (29,305) | Non-TANF (37,694) | |
| Percentage of cases receiving child care assistance at any time during indicated period | | | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 0.9% | 10.2% | 5.0% | 6.1% |
| Quarter 1 | 0.9 | 9.7 | 4.6 | 5.7 |
| Quarter 2 | 0.8 | 9.4 | 4.4 | 5.5 |
| Quarter 3 | 1.1 | 9.1 | 4.5 | 5.5 |
| Quarter 4 | 1.1 | 9.0 | 4.5 | 5.5 |
| Quarter 5 | 1.2 | 9.0 | 4.7 | 5.6 |
| Quarters 1 through 5 | 2.0 | 16.0 | 8.0 | 9.7 |

Base: Cases with any adult or child food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Exhibit 2-10**Receipt of Emergency Assistance**

| Follow-up Period | Cases with ABAWD Exiters (15,454) | Cases with Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (82,453) |
|---|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (29,305) | Non-TANF (37,694) | |
| Percentage of cases receiving emergency assistance at any time during indicated period | | | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | 0.6% | 1.5% | 0.9% | 1.1% |
| Quarter 1 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| Quarter 2 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Quarter 3 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Quarter 4 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Quarter 5 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Quarters 1 through 5 | 1.7 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.7 |

Base: Cases with any adult or child food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Reported Child Maltreatment

The extent of child maltreatment is difficult to assess; the only available administrative evidence comes through instances reported to the state's Child Welfare Service and Child Protective Service. On this basis, as shown in Exhibit 2-11, the percentage of cases with any substantiated report of child maltreatment at any time during the follow-up period (through March 1999) was 5 percent for the TANF subgroup, 3 percent for the non-TANF subgroup, and 1 percent for the ABAWD subgroup. In less than half of these instances, the situation was regarded as serious enough to warrant removing the child from the home and placing him or her in care elsewhere.

Exhibit 2-11**Incidence of Child Maltreatment**

| | Cases with ABAWD Exiters (15,454) | Cases with Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (82,453) |
|---|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (29,305) | Non-TANF (37,694) | |
| Percentage of cases with any substantiated report of child maltreatment | 1.0% | 5.0% | 2.6% | 3.2% |
| Percentage of cases in which a child was removed from the home and placed in care elsewhere | 0.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 1.3 |

Base: Cases with any adult or child food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Combined Administratively-Reported Income

The income sources reported in the administrative data include food stamps, cash assistance, earnings, child support payments, child care assistance, and emergency assistance. One can aggregate such income at the household level by summing the income amounts associated with all members of the household, including the earnings in covered employment of all household members. The resulting measure of “combined administratively-reported income” is one indicator of the income available to households with food stamp exiters.

As shown in Exhibit 2-12, all three subgroups experienced an increase during the follow-up period in their average quarterly amount of administratively-reported income. The proportional increase from the exit quarter to quarter 5 was greatest for the ABAWD subgroup, at 17 percent (from \$1,624 to \$1,902). The corresponding increases were 14 percent for the non-TANF subgroup (from \$2,060 to \$2,340) and 11 percent for the TANF subgroup (from \$1,857 to \$2,056). One must exercise caution in interpreting these findings, however. The averages for both non-ABAWD subgroups were likely drawn down by the number of child-only cases, which would have experienced little or no earnings.

Exhibit 2-12**Combined Administratively-Reported Income^a**

| Follow-up Period | Cases with ABAWD Exiters (15,454) | Cases with Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (82,453) |
|---|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | TANF (29,305) | Non-TANF (37,694) | |
| Average quarterly administratively-reported income during indicated period | | | | |
| Quarter 0 (exit) | \$1,624 | \$1,857 | \$2,060 | \$1,906 |
| Quarter 1 | 1,681 | 1,709 | 2,055 | 1,862 |
| Quarter 2 | 1,728 | 1,829 | 2,134 | 1,950 |
| Quarter 3 | 1,801 | 1,919 | 2,208 | 2,029 |
| Quarter 4 | 1,852 | 1,973 | 2,270 | 2,086 |
| Quarter 5 | 1,902 | 2,056 | 2,340 | 2,157 |
| Quarters 1 through 5 | 1,793 | 1,897 | 2,201 | 2,017 |

a Includes food stamps, cash assistance, earnings, child support payments, child care assistance, and emergency assistance.

Base: Cases with any adult or child food stamp exiters during calendar year 1997 in the Phoenix-Mesa MSA.

Source: ADES, administrative data.

Chapter 3

Survey-Reported Employment and Income

This chapter presents the survey findings with respect to employment, job-related benefits, health insurance, and income. These findings are derived from the 696 survey respondents who were interviewed between May and October 1999. The interview thus occurred 18 to 34 months following the food stamp exit.¹ The outcome measures examined here include education and training, employment status, reasons for not working, employer-provided benefits, health insurance coverage, and household income.

In this chapter, and in the two that follow, the survey findings are reported in a consistent format. Exhibits show the survey responses tabulated separately for each subgroup and for the weighted total of the three subgroups. The right-hand column of each table indicates whether, for the corresponding survey-measured outcome, one can reject the null hypothesis of equal values among the three subgroups. Asterisks in the right-hand column indicate that this hypothesis can be rejected at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance. Where no asterisks appear in this column, one cannot reject the null hypothesis at the 0.10 significance level.²

The key findings presented in this chapter are as follows:

- More than 70 percent of exiters had not completed high school; 15 percent were engaged in some education or training activity at the time of the interview.
- 50 percent of exiters were employed at the time of the interview, with the ABAWD subgroup having the highest employment rate, at 62 percent. Average monthly earnings for those employed at the interview was \$1,474.
- For unemployed exiters, the main reasons for not working pertained to illness, health, problems, or disability (51 percent of those not employed) and the need or desire to stay home with children (22 percent of those not employed).
- Fully 46 percent of exiters had no health insurance coverage. Another 38 percent received their health coverage through Medicaid, Medicare, and other sources unrelated to their employment. The remaining 16 percent had employer-provided health insurance, sometimes combined with other coverage.

1 The interval would only have been 18 months for those whose exit month was December 1997 and whose interview month was May 1999. In contrast, the elapsed time would have been fully 34 months for those who exited in January 1997 and were interviewed in October 1999.

2 For outcomes measured as proportions, a chi-square significance test was performed, treating the survey estimates as cell frequencies in a 2 x 3 contingency table (or a 2 x 2 contingency table, when ABAWDs were excluded from the tabulation of child-related outcomes). For outcomes measured as means, such as dollar amounts, analysis of variance was used to test for the significance of differences among the subgroup means. Such tests took account of the differential weighting of sample observations.

- Including both earned and unearned sources of money income, monthly household income averaged \$1,473 for all exiters. Income as a percentage of the federal poverty level averaged 114 percent. The percentage with incomes below the poverty level was highest for the TANF subgroup (55 percent).

3.1 Employment

Here we describe the job situation of food stamp exiters, at both the time of the exit and the time of the interview. As noted previously, the interview month occurred 18 to 34 months after the exit. The survey-derived employment outcomes provide important additional information beyond that contained in the administrative data. In particular, the survey measures include self-employment, casual and seasonal labor, and other forms of paid work not covered by unemployment insurance (UI) and thus not reported through the state's UI system.

Education and Training

Because education and training are important factors in determining one's employment prospects, it is useful to first examine these characteristics of the surveyed exiters. As shown in Exhibit 3-1, more than 70 percent of them had not completed high school. The percentage was highest for the TANF subgroup, with 77 percent having neither a high school diploma nor a GED. In each subgroup 4 to 6 percent had completed high school or a GED program, but with no post-secondary education. Of the total sample, 23 percent had completed at least some college education. This percentage was highest for the ABAWD subgroup, at 33 percent. Separately, 12 to 14 percent of each subgroup had a trade license or certificate.

It is important to note that 15 percent of exiters were engaged in some education or training activity at the time of the interview, as shown in Exhibit 3-2. The most prevalent activities were community college or other college classes, on-the-job training, and occupational classroom training.

Employment Rate

As shown in Exhibit 3-3, one-half of the exiters (50 percent) were employed at the time of the interview. The highest employment rate was among the ABAWD subgroup, at 62 percent. For each subgroup, the employment rate was lower at the interview month than at the exit month, by 2 to 5 percentage points. (For the non-ABAWD subgroups, this drop was statistically significant.)

Note that the 62 percent survey-reported employment rate for the ABAWD subgroup exceeds by 10 percentage points or more the rate indicated by the UI data for this subgroup in any follow-up quarter. Several factors may explain this: the previously noted forms of employment not included in the UI data, the later timing of the survey during the post-exit period, sampling variation, and survey

nonresponse bias. For each of the non-ABAWD subgroups, in contrast, the employment rate found through the survey was similar to that found through the UI data.³

3 One can compare the employment rates found in our survey with those reported for the U.S. in the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF), conducted by the Urban Institute. For prime-aged adults (aged 25 to 64) with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty level, 62 percent were employed at the time of their NSAF interview in 1999. See Sheila Zedlewski, "Family Economic Well-Being: Findings from the National Survey of America's Families," Urban Institute, October 2000, pp. 4-5.

Exhibit 3-1

Educational Status

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | | See Note. |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | Total (696) | |
| Distribution of survey respondents | | | | | |
| Highest grade or level of schooling completed | | | | | |
| 8th grade or less | 18.4% | 21.6% | 33.6% | 26.4% | *** |
| 9th grade | 2.6 | 12.9 | 7.5 | 8.2 | *** |
| 10th grade | 19.7 | 17.4 | 15.0 | 16.8 | |
| 11th grade | 21.1 | 25.0 | 16.8 | 20.4 | ** |
| Subtotal | 61.8 | 76.9 | 72.9 | 71.8 | ** |
| 12th grade or GED | 5.3 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 5.1 | |
| Some college | 27.6 | 16.3 | 17.3 | 19.2 | ** |
| Associate degree | 5.3 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | |
| Bachelor's degree | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | |
| Graduate degree | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Subtotal | 32.9 | 18.9 | 21.5 | 23.1 | ** |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Has trade license or certificate | 12.2 | 14.0 | 12.3 | 12.8 | |

Base: All respondents.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 3-2

Education and Training Activities

| Status at Interview | ABAWD Exitters (90) | | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|---|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | Total (696) | | |
| Distribution of respondents | | | | | | | |
| Participating in any of the following activities | | | | | | | |
| GED or high school equivalency program or regular high school classes | 2.2% | 3.7% | 0.7% | 2.0% | | | ** |
| Literacy or basic education classes | 4.4 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 1.6 | | | ** |
| English as a second language (ESL) course | 3.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.7 | | | |
| Community college or college classes | 7.8 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 5.4 | | | |
| Classroom training for a specific job, trade, or occupation | 3.3 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.7 | | | |
| On-the-job training offered through employer | 5.6 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 5.0 | | | |
| Job club or job-readiness workshop | 1.1 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.9 | | | |
| Unpaid work experience program | 0.0 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 | | | |
| Subtotal ^a | 16.7 | 18.3 | 11.6 | 14.7 | | | * |
| Participating in none of the above activities | 83.3 | 81.7 | 88.4 | 85.3 | | | * |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |

Base: All respondents

a Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the subtotal because respondents were asked to indicate all applicable categories.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 3-3

Employment Status

| Status at Exit/Interview | ABAWD | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|---|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Working full-time or part-time at job for pay | | | | | |
| At exit | 64.0% | 55.8% | 49.6% | 54.5% | ** |
| At interview | 61.8 | 50.5 | 44.3 | 49.8 | ** |
| At both exit and interview | | | | | |
| At same job | 19.1 | 18.8 | 18.4 | 18.7 | |
| At different job | 29.2 | 19.7 | 18.8 | 21.2 | * |
| Subtotal ^a | 48.3 | 38.6 | 37.2 | 39.9 | |

Distribution of respondents

Base: All respondents.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

The data presented in Exhibit 3-3 indicate that, among those employed at the interview month in each subgroup, more than three-fourths had also been employed at the exit month. For the non-ABAWD subgroups, those employed at both the interview month and the exit month (comprising 37 to 39 percent of each subgroup) were about equally likely to have worked at the same job during both periods as to have changed jobs. Workers in the ABAWD subgroup, in contrast, showed a much higher degree of job mobility; that is, a substantially higher percentage of exiters in this subgroup were employed at a different job at the interview than at the exit.

Job Situation for Those Employed

Exhibit 3-4 shows further detail about the employment situation of those working at the time of the interview. A small percentage of those employed in each subgroup (4 to 6 percent) held multiple jobs. The main jobs of all those employed at interview were divided approximately evenly among those starting in 1997 or earlier, those starting in 1998, and those starting in 1999. The exhibit also indicates that the average weekly hours and the average monthly pay at the current job had increased somewhat since the starting date. Average monthly earnings were highest among the non-TANF subgroup, at \$1,638.

Exhibit 3-5 indicates that for more than one-third of exiters there were other employed household members (not including the respondent). This was more prevalent in the non-ABAWD subgroups, reflecting the larger household sizes and the employment of spouses and older children.

Reasons for Not Working

For those exiters not working at the time of the interview, the pattern of reasons differed by subgroup, as shown in Exhibit 3-6. For the ABAWD and non-TANF subgroups, the “main reason you are not working at this time” was related to personal illness, health problems, or disability, cited by more than 60 percent of those not working. That this rate is so high for the ABAWD subgroup raises a concern that some may have undiagnosed disabilities and have been incorrectly classified as “able-bodied.” For instance, some may have problems with substance abuse or mental illness that were never disclosed to their caseworker.

For the TANF subgroup, in contrast, the most-cited reason was the need or desire to stay home with children, as identified by 35 percent of those not working. (Another 11 percent of this subgroup cited problems with child care.) Other frequently-mentioned reasons were schooling and the lack of work in the local geographic area.

An even more inclusive list of reasons for not working is shown in Exhibit 3-7. These reasons were cited by respondents as “very important.” In addition to those already noted, other frequently-cited reasons pertained to the need to care for a sick relative and the perception of employers that the respondent was too young or too old to work.

Exhibit 3-4

Employment Situation of Those Employed

| Status at Indicated Time | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (346) | See Note. |
|--|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (56) | TANF (164) | Non-TANF (126) | | |
| Distribution of those employed at interview | | | | | |
| Number of jobs held at time of interview | | | | | |
| 1 | 96.4% | 93.9% | 95.2% | 95.1% | |
| 2 | 3.6 | 6.1 | 4.0 | 4.5 | |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | |
| Year in which you started your main job | | | | | |
| 1995 or earlier | 7.7 | 4.4 | 14.9 | 9.7 | *** |
| 1996 | 7.7 | 4.4 | 9.1 | 7.2 | |
| 1997 | 19.2 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.1 | |
| 1998 | 38.5 | 29.1 | 24.8 | 29.6 | |
| 1999 | 26.9 | 43.0 | 32.2 | 34.4 | ** |
| Hours per week on main job, when you began working there | | | | | |
| 1 to 10 hours | 5.6 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.7 | |
| 11 to 20 hours | 14.8 | 15.0 | 8.1 | 12.0 | |
| 21 to 30 hours | 13.0 | 13.8 | 16.1 | 14.6 | |

(cont.)

Exhibit 3-4 (cont.)

Employment Situation of Those Employed

| Status at Indicated Time | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | | Total (346) | See Note. |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exiters (56) | TANF (164) | Non-TANF (126) | | |
| Distribution of those employed at interview | | | | | |
| 31 to 40 hours | 57.4% | 60.0% | 62.1% | 60.3% | |
| More than 40 hours | 9.3 | 6.3 | 9.7 | 8.5 | |
| Mean | 33.8 | 34.0 | 35.6 | 34.6 | |
| Hours per week on main job, at interview | | | | | |
| 1 to 10 hours | 1.9 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.4 | |
| 11 to 20 hours | 7.5 | 10.3 | 4.8 | 7.2 | |
| 21 to 30 hours | 13.2 | 12.2 | 17.6 | 14.8 | |
| 31 to 40 hours | 60.4 | 57.1 | 56.0 | 57.4 | |
| More than 40 hours | 17.0 | 16.7 | 17.6 | 17.2 | |
| Mean | 37.2 | 36.6 | 36.9 | 36.9 | |
| How much you earned per month at main job, when you began working there | | | | | |
| Mean | \$1,282 | \$1,125 | \$1,276 | \$1,230 | |
| How much you earned per month at main job, at interview | | | | | |
| Mean | \$1,443 | \$1,277 | \$1,638 | \$1,474 | |

Base: Respondents working at a job for pay at time of interview.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 3-5

Number of Employed Persons in Household, Excluding Respondent

| Status During Month Prior to Interview | ABAWD Exiters (90) | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Distribution of survey respondents | | | | | |
| Number of persons 15 years or older in respondent's household (excluding respondent) who worked at any job for pay | | | | | |
| 0 | 71.1% | 60.9% | 60.2% | 62.6% | |
| 1 | 23.3 | 33.5 | 33.5 | 31.4 | |
| 2 | 5.6 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 5.1 | |
| 3 or more | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Base: All respondents.

Note: For none of these rows can one reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*) level of significance.

Exhibit 3-6

Main Reason Not Working

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | | Total (350) | See Note. |
|--|---------------------|------------|----------------|-------|-------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (34) | TANF (158) | Non-TANF (158) | | | |
| Distribution of survey respondents not working | | | | | | |
| Main reason not working at time of interview | | | | | | |
| Need/Want to stay home with children | 8.7% | 34.7% | 17.5% | 21.9% | *** | |
| Illness/Health problems/Disability | 60.9 | 29.7 | 62.1 | 51.1 | *** | |
| Substance abuse | 4.3 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 2.4 | *** | |
| In school | 4.3 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.1 | | |
| Transportation problems | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | | |
| Problems with availability of child care | 8.7 | 5.9 | 1.9 | 4.3 | * | |
| Problems with quality of child care | 0.0 | 3.4 | 1.9 | 2.1 | | |
| Problems with finding child care within proximity to residence | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | | |
| Problems with cost of child care | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | | |
| Unable to find a good job | 0.0 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.8 | | |
| No work in local geographic area | 8.7 | 7.6 | 1.9 | 4.9 | ** | |
| No jobs in line of work | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Lack necessary schooling, training, skills, experience | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | | |
| Employers think you are too young or too old | 4.3 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.0 | ** | |
| Working does not pay enough | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 2.0 | | |
| Need to care for sick relative | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | | |
| Difficulty getting along with others in workplace | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 1.4 | *** | |
| Difficulty reading/writing/speaking English | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | | |

Base: Respondents not working at a job for pay at time of interview.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 3-7

Respondents Citing a Reason as “Very Important” for Not Working

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | | Total (350) | See Note. |
|---|--|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exiters (34) | TANF (158) | Non-TANF (158) | | |
| | Percentage citing the indicated reason as “very important” | | | | |
| You need/want to stay home with your children | 15.8% | 36.9% | 33.0% | 31.9% | ** |
| You or your children are ill, have health problems, or are disabled | 23.1 | 42.2 | 37.3 | 37.7 | |
| You have a substance abuse problem | 9.1 | 5.7 | 6.1 | 6.4 | |
| You are in school or a training program | 0.0 | 18.7 | 11.1 | 12.0 | *** |
| You have transportation problems | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| You cannot afford to pay for child care | 21.7 | 38.4 | 32.8 | 33.2 | |
| It is difficult to find the kind of child care that you want | 9.5 | 45.8 | 27.1 | 31.2 | *** |
| It is difficult to find quality day care | 9.5 | 50.8 | 24.6 | 31.5 | *** |
| You have been unable to find a job | 14.3 | 50.0 | 29.8 | 34.6 | *** |
| There is no work in your local geographic area | 4.8 | 39.8 | 23.9 | 27.0 | *** |
| You need to care for a sick relative | 26.9 | 42.0 | 23.6 | 30.2 | *** |
| There are no jobs in your line of work | 24.1 | 24.6 | 21.9 | 23.1 | |
| You lack the necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience | 16.7 | 19.2 | 17.3 | 17.8 | |
| Employers think you are too old | 11.1 | 22.1 | 19.2 | 19.0 | |
| Employers think you are too young | 20.7 | 39.3 | 31.8 | 32.5 | ** |
| Working does not pay as much as staying on welfare | 7.1 | 11.0 | 18.9 | 14.7 | ** |
| You have difficulty getting along with others | 3.6 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 5.3 | |
| You have difficulty reading, writing, or speaking English | 10.3 | 13.5 | 8.5 | 10.3 | |

Base: Respondents not working at a job for pay at time of interview.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

3.2 Health Insurance

This section focuses on the availability of health insurance coverage for adult exiters. For many employed exiters, this was an employer-provided benefit. For those not employed, however, there were clearly difficulties in obtaining coverage.

Among those exiters who were working, one-third (33 percent) received employer-provided health insurance, as shown in Exhibit 3-8. For the job-related benefits listed in the exhibit, relating to paid days off and pension and health benefits, the proportion of those employed who received such benefits was typically in the range of 30 to 50 percent for the non-ABAWD subgroups and 20 to 30 percent for the ABAWD subgroup. The differences among subgroups were found significant only for paid vacation days.

As shown in Exhibit 3-9, most of the non-ABAWD exiters with employer-provided health insurance had coverage for both themselves and other family members. More than 80 percent of those with employer-provided health benefits in the non-ABAWD subgroups had to pay for some of the cost themselves. Some of those with employer-provided coverage also participated in Medicaid, which in Arizona is called the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (or AHCCCS) or Medicare. The percentage also receiving Medicare was significantly higher for the non-TANF subgroup, reflecting their older ages.

Exhibit 3-10 profiles the health insurance status of all survey respondents, including both those employed and those not employed. The most striking finding is that nearly one-half of the food stamp exiters (46 percent) had no health insurance coverage, either from an employer, from Medicare or Medicaid, or from a private insurer. This percentage exceeds one-half for the ABAWD subgroup (52 percent), and is somewhat lower (44 percent) for both non-ABAWD subgroups. These estimates include both employed and unemployed exiters who received no coverage from an employer or any other source.⁴

The 54 percent of all exiters with some form of health insurance coverage can be divided among the following categories: those not employed but receiving health insurance through Medicaid, Medicare, or other sources (28 percent); those employed and not covered by their employer but receiving health insurance through Medicaid, Medicare, or other sources (9 percent); those employed and receiving employer-provided coverage only (15 percent); and those employed and receiving coverage both from their employer and from other sources (2 percent).

4 Findings from the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF) provide a benchmark for our estimates of the percentage of food stamp exiters lacking health insurance coverage. The NSAF-estimated national percentage of nonelderly adults (aged 18 to 64) without health insurance was 34.9 percent in 1999 for those with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty level (39.0 percent for those below 100 percent of the poverty level and 32.0 percent for those between 100 and 200 percent of the poverty level). See Stephen Zuckerman, Jennifer Haley, and John Holahan, "Health Insurance, Access, and Health Status of Nonelderly Adults: Findings from the National Survey of America's Families," Urban Institute, October 2000, p. 3.

Exhibit 3-8

Employment Benefits for Those Employed

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (346) | See Note. |
|---|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (56) | TANF (164) | Non-TANF (126) | | |
| Whether you receive at your current job . . . | | | | | |
| Paid sick days | 23.6% | 36.0% | 32.0% | 31.2% | |
| Paid vacation days | 23.6 | 43.8 | 42.1 | 38.0 | ** |
| Paid holidays | 35.7 | 48.4 | 43.7 | 43.1 | |
| Dental benefits | 21.4 | 30.9 | 28.6 | 27.5 | |
| Assistance with paying for child care | 1.8 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.8 | |
| Pension plan or other retirement benefits | 28.6 | 36.3 | 37.5 | 34.8 | |
| Health insurance (employer-provided) | 30.4 | 35.8 | 33.1 | 33.2 | |

Distribution of those employed at interview

Base: Respondents working at a job for pay at time of interview.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 3-9

Health Insurance Status for Those with Employer-Provided Health Insurance

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | See Note. |
|--|---------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (17) | TANF (59) | Non-TANF (41) | |
| Distribution of those with employer-provided health insurance at interview | | | | |
| Extent of employer-provided coverage | | | | |
| for respondent only | ^a | 35.6% | 22.5% | 28.4% |
| for respondent and family members | ^a | 64.4 | 77.5 | 71.6 |
| Whether respondent has to pay any of the cost of this insurance | ^a | 82.8 | 82.9 | 82.9 |
| Whether respondent has other health insurance coverage through . . . | | | | |
| Medicaid (AHCCCS) | ^a | 31.1% | 21.8% | 26.0% |
| Medicare | ^a | 3.1 | 18.3 | 11.4 |
| Other health insurance programs for which respondent pays | ^a | 6.5 | 6.0 | 6.2 |
| Other | ^a | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.9 |

Base: Respondents working at a job for pay at time of interview, with employer-provided health insurance.

^a Finding not tabulated because of insufficient sample.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 3-10

Health Insurance Status of All Respondents

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitors | | | See Note. | |
|--|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| | ABAWD Exitors (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | Total (696) |
| Distribution of respondents | | | | | |
| Employed and receiving employer-provided health insurance, and also receiving health insurance through . . . | | | | | |
| Medicaid (AHCCCS) | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.7% | 0.7% | |
| Medicare | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Other health insurance programs for which respondent pays | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | |
| Other | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | |
| Subtotal ^a | 2.2 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 2.0 | |
| Employed and receiving employer-provided health insurance only | 16.7 | 15.2 | 13.0 | 14.5 | |
| Employed and not receiving employer-provided health insurance, but receiving health insurance through . . . | | | | | |
| Medicaid (AHCCCS) | 5.6 | 8.1 | 4.6 | 5.9 | |
| Medicare | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.4 | |
| Other health insurance programs for which respondent pays | 5.6 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.6 | |
| Other | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 | ** |
| Subtotal ^a | 10.0 | 11.5 | 7.7 | 9.4 | |

(cont.)

Exhibit 3-10 (cont.)

Health Insurance Status of All Respondents

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitors | | | See Note. |
|---|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exitors (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | |
| Distribution of respondents | | | | |
| Not employed but receiving health insurance through . . . | | | | |
| Medicaid (AHCCCS) | 14.4% | 21.7% | 16.5% | 17.7% |
| Medicare | 7.8 | 2.8 | 17.6 | 11.0 *** |
| Other health insurance programs for which respondent pays | 1.1 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 3.6 |
| Other | 1.1 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 1.6 |
| Subtotal ^a | 18.9 | 26.4 | 33.5 | 28.3 ** |
| Uninsured | | | | |
| Employed but not receiving any health insurance | 33.3 | 21.4 | 22.2 | 24.2 ** |
| Unemployed and not receiving any health insurance | 18.9 | 22.7 | 22.2 | 21.7 |
| Subtotal | 52.2 | 44.1 | 44.4 | 45.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Base: All respondents

a. Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the subtotal because respondents were asked to indicate all applicable categories.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

3.3 Household Income

In the course of the survey, respondents were asked to itemize their sources of income in the last month and to report the amount received by source, including amounts received by the respondent themselves and by all other household members.

Exhibit 3-11 shows the incidence of receipt of unearned income. Note that 25 percent of the respondents were in households receiving food stamp benefits. This rate of food stamp receipt was 33 percent for the TANF subgroup, and 21 percent each for the ABAWD and non-TANF subgroups.⁵ Other frequently reported sources of unearned income were free or reduced-price school lunch or breakfast (24 percent of total exiters); the Earned Income Tax Credit (20 percent); Social Security (19 percent); Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program benefits (16 percent); Supplemental Security Income (also 16 percent); child support payments (9 percent); and TANF cash assistance (6 percent).

The average amounts of monthly household money income are shown by subgroup in Exhibit 3-12. These estimates include only money income, and thus do not include such items as food stamps, WIC benefits, and school lunch or breakfast benefits. By subgroup, average monthly household income was highest for the non-TANF subgroup (\$1,503), followed by the TANF subgroup (\$1,470) and the ABAWD subgroup (\$1,406). However, these differences among subgroups were not statistically significant. The overall average for exiters was \$1,473.

The ordinal relationship of income by subgroup is the same as that cited in Chapter 2 based on the administrative data. Note that the amounts shown in Chapter 2, if divided by three to provide average monthly values, would be in the range of only \$525 to \$675, less than one-half of the numbers shown here. There are several reasons for the higher survey-based income estimates. First, the survey included many more public and private sources of unearned income than were available in the state's administrative data—most notably, Supplemental Security Income, Social Security, and the Earned Income Tax Credit. Second, as noted earlier, the wages reported through the state's UI system do not include many forms of paid work. Third, the survey used a household-level income definition, which associated more persons with each exiter than under the case-level income definition applied in the administrative data. Fourth, the survey data pertained to income received at a later post-exit interval (i.e., 18 to 34 months after exit, versus the 5 quarters available for all exiters in the administrative data), with the survey thus capturing the upward income trend over a longer interval.⁶

5 These percentages are higher than those indicated in Chapter 2 from the administrative data. This may reflect the longer survey-measured follow-up period, with elapsed intervals of up to 34 months between the exit month and the interview month.

6 Conversely, on several lesser grounds the administratively-derived income estimates are more inclusive than the survey-based estimates. First, the administrative estimates include program benefits for food stamps, child care assistance, and emergency assistance. (Food stamp benefits, if included in the survey data, would raise the average monthly household income estimates by about \$10 for the ABAWD subgroup, \$50 for the TANF subgroup, and \$30 for the non-TANF subgroup.) Second, the administrative estimates are not subject to the survey under-reporting of state-administered cash assistance and child support payments. These factors are very minor, however, when compared to those noted in the text that tend to make the administrative estimates of income lower than the survey estimates.

Exhibit 3-11

Household Unearned Income Sources

| Status in Month Prior to Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | See Note. | |
|--|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | Total (696) |
| Whether you or other household members received | | | | | |
| Unemployment insurance | 2.2% | 0.9% | 1.8% | 1.6% | |
| Worker's compensation | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 1.2 | |
| Cash assistance through TANF | 1.1 | 13.0 | 3.2 | 5.8 | *** |
| Food stamps | 21.1 | 32.6 | 20.8 | 24.5 | *** |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) | 11.1 | 11.8 | 20.1 | 15.7 | *** |
| General Assistance | 5.6 | 5.0 | 1.8 | 3.5 | * |
| Child support payments | 3.3 | 14.0 | 7.7 | 8.8 | *** |
| Alimony payments | 1.1 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 2.0 | |
| Social Security, including disability benefits | 13.3 | 10.9 | 26.4 | 18.9 | *** |
| Other retirement, pension, or disability benefits, public or private | 4.4 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 2.7 | |
| Rental income or payments from roomers or boarders | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.4 | |
| Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program benefits | 5.6 | 18.9 | 18.7 | 16.1 | *** |
| Free or reduced-price school lunch or breakfast | 6.7 | 38.8 | 21.8 | 24.0 | *** |
| Income from the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) | 7.8 | 26.1 | 21.8 | 20.3 | *** |

Base: All respondents.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 3-12

Total Household Money Income

| Status in Month Prior to Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|--|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Earnings | | | | | |
| Respondent's earnings | \$956 | \$872 | \$814 | \$861 | |
| Other's earnings | 263 | 292 | 320 | 300 | |
| Mean's-tested benefits | | | | | |
| Cash assistance through TANF | 2 | 41 | 8 | 17 | *** |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) | 55 | 57 | 99 | 77 | ** |
| General Assistance | 6 | 14 | 4 | 7 | ** |
| Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) | 10 | 32 | 22 | 22 | *** |
| Other income | | | | | |
| Unemployment insurance | 7 | 4 | 7 | 6 | |
| Worker's compensation | 3 | 8 | 5 | 6 | |
| Child support payments | 24 | 33 | 23 | 26 | |
| Alimony payments | 6 | 3 | 7 | 5 | |
| Social Security, including disability benefits | 51 | 65 | 149 | 103 | *** |
| Other retirement, pension, or disability benefits, public or private | 18 | 5 | 14 | 12 | |
| Rental income or payments from roomers or boarders | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4 | |
| Any other income | 3 | 42 | 26 | 26 | |
| Total money income | \$1,406 | \$1,470 | \$1,503 | \$1,473 | |

Base: All respondents.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

We also used the survey data to compute each household's money income as a percentage of the federal poverty level, using the 1999 federal weighted-average poverty threshold for the corresponding household size. This provides a more informative measure of income, as household size varied substantially among the subgroups. (As previously noted, 62 percent of the ABAWD exiters were in one- or two-person households, compared to 35 percent for the non-TANF subgroup and 11 percent for the TANF subgroup.)

When household income is scaled by the federal poverty threshold, it is the ABAWD subgroup whose survey-reported income is highest, averaging 143 percent of the poverty level. As shown in Exhibit 3-13, this compares to 117 percent for the non-TANF subgroup and 102 percent for the TANF subgroup. Note that more than one-half of the TANF subgroup (55 percent) and nearly one-half of the non-TANF subgroup (46 percent) had incomes below the poverty level.

Exhibit 3-13

Poverty Status

| Status in Month Prior to Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|--|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Distribution of survey respondents | | | | | |
| Total household money income as a percentage of the federal poverty level ^a | | | | | |
| 0 to 49 percent | 18.9% | 25.5% | 17.6% | 21.4% | ** |
| 50 to 99 percent | 17.8 | 29.2 | 28.5 | 27.4 | * |
| Subtotal | 36.7 | 54.7 | 46.1 | 48.8 | *** |
| 100 to 149 percent | 22.2 | 21.7 | 25.4 | 23.3 | |
| 150 to 199 percent | 18.9 | 11.5 | 13.7 | 13.4 | |
| 200 to 249 percent | 7.8 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 7.6 | |
| 250 percent or more | 14.4 | 4.7 | 7.0 | 6.9 | *** |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Mean value | 143.3 | 102.4 | 117.2 | 113.7 | *** |

Base: All respondents.

a Annualized survey-reported household money income as a percentage of the 1999 federal weighted-average poverty threshold for the corresponding household size.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Chapter 4

Survey-Reported Household Arrangements

This chapter presents the survey findings with respect to the basic household arrangements of Arizona food stamp exiters. The outcomes examined here include household size, housing status, marital status, and child care arrangements.

The key survey-reported findings with respect to these basic household arrangements are as follows:

- 62 percent of respondents in the ABAWD subgroup were living either alone or with one other person. In contrast, 44 percent of the TANF respondents and 32 percent of the non-TANF respondents were in households with at least four other persons.
- More than one-half of the respondents in each subgroup rented their homes or apartments. The extent of homeownership was greatest among the non-TANF respondents, at 25 percent.
- Among the three subgroups, 7 to 13 percent of respondents received Section 8 rental assistance, 6 to 12 percent were in public housing, and 1 to 2 percent lived either “on the street” or in a group shelter.
- The percentage of respondents residing with a spouse or partner at both the exit month and the interview month was highest for the non-TANF subgroup (at 34 percent), followed by the ABAWD subgroup (at 25 percent) and the TANF subgroup (at 23 percent).
- Among the children 12 years or younger of non-ABAWD survey respondents, more than three-fourths (77 percent) were not in any regular child care arrangement for any part of the day.
- For those children in regular child care among non-ABAWD exiters, more than two-thirds (69 percent) of their parents were “very satisfied” with the arrangement and nearly one-fourth (24 percent) were “satisfied.”
- Among the non-ABAWD respondents with children in regular child care, more than two-thirds (72 percent) made some payment for it. Less than one quarter (23 percent) received any help in paying for child care.

4.1 Household Size and Housing Status

Basic living arrangements differed considerably among the three subgroups of exiters. In terms of household size, 62 percent of those in the ABAWD subgroup were living either alone (29 percent) or with one other person (33 percent) at the time of the interview, as shown in Exhibit 4-1. In contrast, the percentage living with no others or only one other was 35 percent for the non-TANF subgroup and 11 percent for the TANF subgroup. At the other extreme, nearly one-half (44 percent) of the

Exhibit 4-1

Number of Others in Household

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitors | | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exitors (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Number of other persons (excluding respondent) in household | | | | | |
| No others | 29.2% | 3.4% | 19.4% | 16.4% | *** |
| 1 other | 32.6 | 7.5 | 15.8 | 16.6 | *** |
| 2 others | 16.9 | 22.9 | 12.0 | 16.4 | *** |
| 3 others | 10.1 | 22.3 | 21.1 | 19.2 | ** |
| 4 others | 6.7 | 21.6 | 16.2 | 16.0 | *** |
| 5 or more others | 4.5 | 22.3 | 15.5 | 15.4 | *** |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Distribution of survey respondents

Base: All respondents

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

TANF exiters lived with four or more others in their household. This was so for 32 percent of the non-TANF respondents and only 11 percent of the ABAWD respondents.

As shown in Exhibit 4-2, housing status was similar across subgroups, to the extent that more than one-half of respondents in each subgroup (55 to 58 percent) rented their home or apartment. One important difference among subgroups was that fully one-quarter (25 percent) of the non-TANF respondents owned their residences. This presumably reflected the older age distribution of the non-TANF subgroup versus the other two subgroups. The ABAWD and TANF subgroups exhibited higher percentages of respondents living with family or friends and paying partial rent or no rent.

Among the three subgroups, 7 to 13 percent received rental assistance through the Section 8 program, 6 to 12 percent resided in public housing, and 1 to 2 percent lived either “on the street” or in a group shelter.¹

4.2 Marital Status

The marital status of exiters at the interview month differed greatly among the subgroups, as shown in Exhibit 4-3. More than one-half (51 percent) of those in the non-TANF subgroup were married and living with their spouses; only 10 percent of this subgroup was never married. In contrast, for the ABAWD and TANF subgroups, the percentages never married were 39 and 33 percent, respectively. Nearly one-fourth of the ABAWD exiters (24 percent) were divorced.

For all three subgroups combined, nearly one-half (46 percent) of exiters resided with a spouse or partner at the exit month, as shown in Exhibit 4-4. This percentage was virtually unchanged at the interview month (45 percent). Among the three subgroups, the non-TANF group was highest in its percentage residing with a spouse or partner, with 51 percent at the exit month and 49 percent at the interview month.

Underlying these seemingly stable percentages, there was a substantial degree of instability in living arrangements. For those residing with a spouse or partner at the exit month, more than one-third were *not* living with a spouse or partner at the interview month. (For the combined sample, this share was 0.174/0.455, or 38 percent.) Conversely, for those not residing with a spouse or partner at the time of the exit, nearly one-third *were* living with a spouse or partner by the time of the interview. (Overall, this share was 0.170/0.545, or 31 percent.) These dynamics were similar across subgroups, with one notable exception. The ABAWD exiters not living with a spouse or partner at exit were less likely (than their counterparts in the non-ABAWD subgroups) to be living with a spouse or partner at the interview month. (For the ABAWDs, this share was 0.125/0.583, or 21 percent.)

1 These findings of course reflect the housing arrangements only of those whom we could locate and interview. For the ABAWD subgroup in particular, the survey may understate the percentage living on the street or in shelters.

Exhibit 4-2

Living Arrangement

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exiters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | Total | | |
| | Distribution of survey respondents | | | | | |
| Owned your own home | 8.4% | 10.1% | 25.4% | 17.2% | | *** |
| Rented home or apartment | 55.4 | 57.5 | 57.1 | 56.9 | | |
| Lived with family or friends and did not pay rent | 19.3 | 15.4 | 6.3 | 11.8 | | *** |
| Lived with family or friends and paid part of the rent | 15.7 | 16.0 | 9.3 | 12.7 | | ** |
| Lived in a group shelter | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.7 | | |
| Lived on the street | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | | |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| Lived in public housing | 5.6 | 12.4 | 11.3 | 10.5 | | |
| Lived in Section 8 housing with reduced rent | 6.7 | 12.7 | 10.6 | 10.4 | | |

Base: All respondents.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 4-3

Marital Status

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|--|---------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Distribution of survey respondents | | | | | |
| Married, living with spouse | 16.7% | 27.6% | 50.7% | 36.6% | *** |
| Married, separated or living apart from spouse | 18.9 | 18.0 | 10.6 | 14.6 | ** |
| Divorced | 24.4 | 17.1 | 18.3 | 19.2 | |
| Widowed | 0.0 | 3.4 | 9.5 | 5.7 | *** |
| Never married | 38.9 | 32.6 | 10.2 | 23.1 | *** |
| Refused/Other | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.0 | |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Base: All respondents.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 4-4

Living Situation with Spouse/Partner

| Status at Exit/Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|---|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Distribution of survey respondents | | | | | |
| Living with spouse/partner at exit | | | | | |
| Living with spouse/partner at interview | 25.0% | 22.8% | 33.8% | 28.1% | *** |
| Not living with spouse/partner at interview | 16.7 | 18.5 | 16.9 | 17.4 | |
| Subtotal | 41.7 | 41.3 | 50.8 | 45.5 | ** |
| Not living with spouse/partner at exit | | | | | |
| Living with spouse/partner at interview | 12.5 | 21.7 | 15.4 | 17.0 | ** |
| Not living with spouse/partner at interview | 45.8 | 37.0 | 33.8 | 37.5 | |
| Subtotal | 58.3 | 58.7 | 49.2 | 54.5 | ** |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Base: All respondents.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

4.3 Child Care Arrangements

Among the children 12 years or younger residing with non-ABAWD survey respondents, more than three-fourths (77 percent) were not in any regular child care arrangement for any part of the day, as shown in Exhibit 4-5. By subgroup, this percentage was 83 percent for the non-TANF subgroup and 71 percent for the TANF subgroup. In the discussion that follows, we do not cite findings for the ABAWD respondents, as there were too few children under age 12 in this subgroup.

For those children who were in some regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day, the most common provider was a grandparent (or great grandparent). This was the situation for 5 percent of the children among non-ABAWD exiters, as also shown in Exhibit 4-5.

For those children in regular day care, nearly one-half (45 percent) were in care for 21 to 40 hours per week, as shown in Exhibit 4-6. The additional percentage of children who were in regular child care for more than 40 hours per week was 14 percent.

For more than two-thirds (69 percent) of children in a regular child care arrangement, the non-ABAWD respondents indicated that they were “very satisfied” with that arrangement. Nearly one-quarter (24 percent) were “satisfied”, as shown in Exhibit 4-7.

Among the non-ABAWD survey respondents with at least one child in regular child care, more than two-thirds (72 percent) made some payment for it, as shown in Exhibit 4-8. Less than one-quarter (23 percent) of the non-ABAWD respondents with children in regular child care received any help in paying for it, as shown in Exhibit 4-9. The most common source of assistance was the Child Care Administration of ADES.

Finally, Exhibit 4-10 indicates that, because of difficulties in maintaining a regular child care arrangement, 19 percent of non-ABAWD respondents with children in child care experienced some disruption to their employment, education, or training. Most typically, such respondents had to quit a job, job search, school, or training. Others did not take a new job or did not start a training program. Note that these findings pertain to those whose children were in a regular child care arrangement; the findings thus do not take account of similar adverse effects among those who provided their own child care.

Exhibit 4-5

Type of Child Care Arrangement

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | See Note. | |
|---|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (31) | TANF (570) | Non-TANF (324) | | Total (894) |
| Distribution of children 12 years or younger among survey respondents | | | | | |
| Not in regular child care arrangement for at least part of day | a | 70.9% | 83.2% | 77.0% | *** |
| In regular child care arrangement for at least part of day | | | | | |
| Child's other parent/stepparent/partner | a | 3.2 | 0.0 | 1.6 | *** |
| Child's grandparent/great grandparent | a | 6.5 | 4.3 | 5.4 | |
| Child's sibling | a | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.4 | |
| Child's other relative | a | 4.9 | 1.6 | 3.3 | ** |
| Babysitter or nonrelative in child's home | a | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.6 | |
| Family daycare or nonrelative in another home | a | 1.1 | 2.8 | 1.9 | |
| Preschool, nursery school, or daycare center | a | 5.6 | 2.5 | 4.1 | ** |
| Headstart | a | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | |
| Extended day, before/after school program | a | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | |
| Other | a | 3.3 | 1.9 | 2.6 | |
| Don't know | a | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.3 | |
| Subtotal | a | 29.1 | 16.8 | 23.0 | *** |
| Total | a | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Base: All children 12 years or younger at interview month, according to date of birth.

a Finding not tabulated because of insufficient sample.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 4-6

Number of Hours in Child Care

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | | | See Note. |
|--|-------------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exiters (8) | TANF (166) | Non-TANF (54) | Total (220) | |
| Number of hours per week that the child is usually in child care | | | | | |
| Less than 5 | ^a | 4.8% | 7.4% | 5.7% | |
| 5 to 20 | ^a | 32.5 | 40.7 | 35.5 | |
| 21 to 40 | ^a | 45.8 | 42.6 | 44.6 | |
| 41 to 50 | ^a | 7.8 | 5.6 | 7.0 | |
| More than 50 | ^a | 9.0 | 3.7 | 7.1 | |
| Total | ^a | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Distribution of children 12 years or younger among survey respondents, who are in a regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day

Base: All children 12 years or younger at interview month (according to date of birth) and in a regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day.

^a Finding not tabulated because of insufficient sample.

Note: For none of these rows can one reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*) level of significance.

Exhibit 4-7

Satisfaction with Child Care Arrangements

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | | | Total (220) | See Note. |
|---|----------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exiters (8) | TANF (166) | Non-TANF (54) | Total | | |
| Level of satisfaction reported by survey respondent | | | | | | |
| Very satisfied | a | 67.5% | 70.4% | 68.6% | | |
| Satisfied | a | 22.9 | 25.9 | 24.0 | | |
| Dissatisfied | a | 6.6 | 0.0 | 4.2 | | * |
| Very dissatisfied | a | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.2 | | |
| Total | a | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Distribution of children 12 years or younger among survey respondents, who are in a regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day

Base: All children 12 years or younger at interview month (according to date of birth) and in regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day.

a Finding not tabulated because of insufficient sample.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 4-8

Payments for Child Care

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | | | Total (105) | See Note. |
|---|----------------------|--------------|------------------|--|----------------|--------------|
| | ABAWD Exiters (7) | TANF (77) | Non-TANF (28) | | | |
| Distribution of respondents with children in child care | | | | | | |
| Reported payments for child care among those with at least one child 12 years or younger in a regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day | | | | | | |
| No payment | a | 26.8% | 30.0% | | 28.0% | |
| Some payment | | | | | | |
| Determined by how much money you earn | a | 32.4 | 20.0 | | 27.6 | |
| Not determined by how much money you earn | a | 40.8 | 50.0 | | 44.4 | |
| Subtotal | a | 73.2 | 70.0 | | 72.0 | |
| Total | a | 100.0 | 100.0 | | 100.0 | |

Base: Respondents with at least one child 12 years or younger at interview month (according to date of birth) and in a regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day.

a Finding not tabulated because of insufficient sample.

Note: For none of these rows can one reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*) level of significance.

Exhibit 4-9

Role of Others in Paying for Child Care

| Status at Interview | ABAWD Exiters (7) | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (105) | See Note. |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | TANF (77) | Non-TANF (28) | | |
| Distribution of respondents with children in child care | | | | | |
| Role of any other individual, agency, or organization in paying all or part of the cost of child care | | | | | |
| No one else helps to pay for child care | a | 75.3% | 78.6% | 76.6% | |
| Others help to pay for child care | | | | | |
| DES Child Care Administration | a | 19.5 | 10.7 | 16.1 | |
| Employer | a | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Noncustodial parent | a | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.8 | |
| Other individual, agency, or organization | a | 1.3 | 7.1 | 3.6 | |
| Subtotal ^b | a | 24.7 | 21.4 | 23.4 | |
| Total | a | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Base: Respondents with at least one child 12 years or younger at interview month (according to date of birth) and in regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day.

a Finding not tabulated because of insufficient sample.

b Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the subtotal because respondents were asked to indicate all applicable categories.

Note: For none of these rows can one reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*) level of significance.

Exhibit 4-10

Problems Arranging or Keeping Child Care, Survey Findings

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | | See Note. |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (7) | TANF (78) | Non-TANF (29) | Total (107) | |
| Distribution of respondents with children in child care | | | | | |
| Because of problems arranging child care or keeping a child care arrangement | | | | | |
| Had to quit a job, school, job search, or training activity | ^a | 16.7% | 17.2% | 16.9% | |
| Did not take a new job or start a training program | ^a | 14.1 | 6.9 | 11.3 | |
| Subtotal ^b | ^a | 20.5 | 17.2 | 19.2 | |
| All others | ^a | 79.5 | 82.8 | 80.8 | |
| Total | ^a | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Base: Respondents with at least one child 12 years or younger at interview month (according to date of birth) and in regular child care arrangement for at least part of the day.

^a Finding not tabulated because of insufficient sample.

^b Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the subtotal because respondents were asked to indicate all applicable categories.

Note: For none of these rows can one reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*) level of significance.

Chapter 5

Survey-Reported Economic Security

This chapter examines the ability of food stamp exiters to meet their basic household living needs during the post-exit period. The survey-reported outcomes analyzed here include satisfaction with one's standard of living and financial situation, level of food security, material hardship, and help received from family, friends, or private organizations.

The key findings presented in this chapter are as follows:

- 30 percent of exiters were “dissatisfied” or very “dissatisfied” with their overall standard of living, 54 percent expressed dissatisfaction with their financial situation, and 33 percent indicated that “there is not enough to make ends meet” at the end of the month.
- Using food security measurement methods developed by USDA, 31 percent of exiters were classified as “food insecure without hunger” and another 23 percent were “food insecure with hunger.” These rates of food insecurity exceeded national estimates for very low income households (those below 50 percent of the federal poverty level). The incidence of food insecurity with moderate or severe hunger was highest among the ABAWD subgroup, at 34 percent.
- More than one-half of exiters (56 percent) reported having experienced at least one of a number of specified forms of material hardship. These included forgoing a dentist visit (36 percent), forgoing a doctor or hospital visit (24 percent), inability to pay rent or mortgage (32 percent, including evictions), and inability to pay utility bills (27 percent). These health-related and housing-related hardships were most pronounced among TANF exiters.
- Most exiters (62 percent) received some form of help from friends or family in the year preceding the interview. For all subgroups combined, the most prevalent forms of such help were emotional support (37 percent), money (27 percent), and food (also 27 percent).
- More than one-third of exiters (38 percent) received help from community organizations, neighborhood centers, or religious organizations in the previous 12 months. The TANF subgroup had the highest reported incidence (44 percent). For the subgroups combined, the most frequently reported form of private organizational help was food from a food bank (25 percent).

5.1 Perceived Well-Being

A substantial percentage of exiters indicated that they were either “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” with particular quality-of-life issues or with their general living standard, as shown in Exhibit 5-1.

Exhibit 5-1

Satisfaction with Standard of Living

| Status at Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|---|---------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Distribution of respondents | | | | | |
| “Dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” with: | | | | | |
| Financial situation | 60.0% | 61.5% | 46.1% | 53.8% | *** |
| Housing | 27.8 | 27.7 | 19.7 | 23.9 | ** |
| Health | 23.3 | 25.8 | 31.3 | 28.0 | |
| Personal medical care | 44.9 | 29.9 | 29.2 | 32.6 | ** |
| Personal clothing | 30.0 | 28.3 | 16.5 | 23.0 | *** |
| Personal furniture | 33.3 | 35.4 | 22.9 | 28.9 | *** |
| Recreational activities | 41.1 | 38.5 | 29.2 | 34.5 | ** |
| Overall standard of living | 36.7 | 34.2 | 23.6 | 29.6 | *** |
| Total (“dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” with one or more of the above ^a) | 76.7 | 79.2 | 70.8 | 74.6 | * |

Base: All respondents

a Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the subtotal because respondents were asked to indicate all applicable categories.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

The survey found that 30 percent of exiters were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their “overall standard of living.” By subgroup, this percentage was lowest among the non-TANF exiters (at 24 percent). More than one-half of all exiters (54 percent) were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their “financial situation.” Once again, it was the non-TANF subgroup that had the lowest percentage (at 46 percent).

Questions were also asked regarding particular living needs: e.g., housing, health, medical care, clothing, furniture, and recreation. Three-fourths (75 percent) of all exiters expressed dissatisfaction with one or more of the issues listed in Exhibit 5-1, but subgroups differed as to which aspects were most problematic. For the ABAWD group, “personal medical care” was a priority concern (45 percent dissatisfied or very dissatisfied); for the non-TANF subgroup, both “health” (31 percent) and “personal medical care” (29 percent) were troublesome.

Survey respondents were also asked, “In general, how do your family finances usually work out at the end of the month?” One-third (33 percent) of all exiters and of those in the ABAWD subgroup indicated that “there is not enough to make ends meet,” as shown in Exhibit 5-2. This finding was consistent with those described above, where financial concerns were also perceived most seriously by the TANF subgroup.

5.2 Food Insecurity

As described in Chapter 1, the survey instrument administered to all respondents included the 18-item food security module developed by USDA/FNS and used by the Census Bureau in regular supplements to the Current Population Survey to provide periodic national and state-by-state estimates of food insecurity.¹

Based on their responses to this series of questions, using a detailed methodology developed by FNS, the survey respondents were classified into the following four categories: food secure, food insecure without hunger, food insecure with moderate hunger, and food insecure with severe hunger. Respondents are classified as food insecure if “at some time during the previous year they were uncertain of having, or unable to acquire, adequate food sufficient to meet basic needs at all times due to inadequate household resources for food.”² Based on the frequency and severity of instances in which the household lacked adequate resources for food, those considered food insecure were then further classified as “without hunger,” “with moderate hunger,” or “with severe hunger.”

Before reporting on the survey findings, it is useful to cite recent statistics on food insecurity for the U.S. population and for Arizona. Data for 1998 indicate that the percentage of total households classified as food insecure without hunger was 10.1 percent for the U.S. and 14.4 percent for Arizona.

1 See Margaret Andrews, Mark Nord, Gary Bickel, and Steven Carlson, “Household Food Security in the United States, 1999,” Food and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report No. 8, Fall 2000.

2 Andrews *et al.*, p. 1.

Exhibit 5-2

Perceptions of Financial Security

| Status at Interview | ABAWD Exiters (90) | Non-ABAWD Exiters | | Total (696) | See Note. |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | |
| Distribution of survey respondents | | | | | |
| "In general, how do your family finances usually work out at the end of the month?" | | | | | |
| There is some money left over | 18.9% | 12.7% | 16.9% | 16.0% | |
| There is just enough to make ends meet | 46.7 | 47.8 | 51.4 | 49.3 | |
| There is not enough money to make ends meet | 33.3 | 37.0 | 29.2 | 32.5 | |
| Refused/Don't know | 1.1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.2 | |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Base: All respondents.

Note: For none of these rows can one reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*) level of significance.

The percentage classified as food insecure with moderate or severe hunger was 3.5 percent for the U.S. and 3.8 percent for Arizona.³ For U.S. households with incomes below 50 percent of the poverty level, the proportion who were food insecure without hunger was 23.1 percent in 1998 and 25.5 percent in 1999; the proportion who were food insecure with moderate or severe hunger was 15.7 percent in 1998 and 13.7 percent in 1999.⁴ Similar statistics for the Arizona low-income population are not available.

As shown in the lower panel of Exhibit 5-3, the survey responses for the combined subgroups indicated that 31 percent of exiters were food insecure without hunger and 23 percent were food insecure with moderate or severe hunger. The incidence of moderate or severe hunger was greatest among the ABAWD subgroup, at 34 percent, compared to 23 percent for the TANF subgroup and 18 percent for the non-TANF subgroup.

In general, these statistics reflect a disproportionately high incidence of food insecurity, compared to U.S. statistics for the low-income population. The percentage of exiters found to have experienced moderate or severe hunger, from 18 to 34 percent across the three subgroups, exceeded the previously cited national estimate of 13.7 percent for the very lowest income households, those below 50 percent of the poverty level.⁵

5.3 Material Hardship

The survey also collected information on forms of material hardship experienced by exiters during the year preceding the interview. As listed in Exhibit 5-4, these hardships included difficulties in paying shelter or utility costs and difficulties in providing for health care or child care.

More than one-half of total exiters (56 percent) and of those in each subgroup experienced at least one of the indicated forms of material hardship. The percentage was highest for the TANF subgroup, at 63 percent. Not shown explicitly in the exhibit, but evident from the pattern of incidence within each subgroup, is that most of those reporting any difficulty had experienced multiple forms of hardship.

The most prevalent form of hardship, experienced by 36 percent of exiters, was that someone in the household needed to see a dentist but could not go. Similarly, 24 percent of exiters reported having forgone a needed doctor visit or hospital visit. By subgroup, the incidence of such health-related hardships was highest for the TANF exiters, followed by the ABAWD and non-TANF subgroups.

3 See Margaret Andrews, Mark Nord, Gary Bickel, and Steven Carlson, "Household Food Security in the United States, 1999," Food and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report No. 8, Fall 2000.

4 Bickel *et al.*, p.8 and Andrews *et al.*, p. 7.

5 Additional benchmark information on food concerns and affordability comes from the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF). The NSAF asked each adult respondent "whether (i) they or their families worried that food would run out before they got money to buy more, (ii) the food they bought did run out, or (iii) one or more adults ate less or skipped meals because there was not enough money to pay for food." For 1999, among those adults with incomes below 200 percent of the poverty level, 43.0 percent had such worries or experienced such difficulties in the previous twelve months. See Zedlewski, pp. 6-7.

Exhibit 5-3

Food Security Status

| Status During Year Prior to Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | See Note. | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (89) | TANF (321) | Non-TANF (283) | | Total (693) |
| Food secure | 46.1 | 40.5 | 50.5 | 46.5 | ** |
| Food insecure without hunger | 20.2 | 36.1 | 31.1 | 30.5 | *** |
| Food insecure with hunger: | | | | | |
| With moderate hunger | 25.8 | 17.4 | 15.5 | 18.2 | * |
| With severe hunger | 7.9 | 5.9 | 2.8 | 4.8 | * |
| Subtotal | 33.7 | 23.3 | 18.3 | 23.0 | *** |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Distribution of respondents

Base: All respondents in the indicated household category (i.e., with/without children under age 18, or all households).

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 5-4

Hardships Experienced

| Status During Year Prior to Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | See Note. |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | |
| | Distribution of respondents | | | |
| Was unable to pay the full amount of rent or mortgage | 32.2% | 28.6% | 23.2% | 26.7% |
| Was evicted from home or apartment for not paying rent or mortgage | 5.6 | 7.5 | 3.9 | 5.3 |
| Did not pay full amount of gas, oil, or electricity bills | 25.6 | 28.0 | 26.8 | 26.9 |
| Had service turned off by gas or electric company, or oil company would not deliver oil | 10.0 | 11.5 | 6.7 | 8.9 |
| Had service disconnected by telephone company because payments were not made | 14.4 | 19.9 | 12.7 | 15.3 |
| Had someone in household who needed to see a doctor or go to hospital but could not go | 24.4 | 28.3 | 20.1 | 23.5 |
| Had someone who needed to see dentist but could not go | 37.8 | 41.6 | 31.7 | 36.0 |
| Placed child/children in foster care or with friends or family because you could no longer afford to take care of them on your own | 3.3 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 2.1 |
| Total (experienced any of the above)^a | 57.8 | 63.4 | 50.4 | 55.9 |

Base: All respondents

^a Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the subtotal because respondents were asked to indicate all applicable categories.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Housing-related hardships also occurred among substantial numbers of exiters. For the combined subgroups, 27 percent had been unable at some time to pay the full amount of their rent or mortgage. Similarly, 27 percent had been unable to meet their utility bills. For some, these difficulties had become severe, as 5 percent had been evicted from their home or apartment, 9 percent had their utilities cut off, and 15 percent had their telephone service disconnected. These instances of telephone nonpayment were, as with health-related hardship, most pronounced among the TANF exiters.⁶

A very small percentage of exiters, 1 to 3 percent in each subgroup, indicated that they had placed children in the care of others (in foster care or with friends or family) because they could no longer afford to care for them on their own.

5.4 Help Received from Others

Most exiters (62 percent) reported having received some form of help from friends or family (including non-custodial parents) during the 12 months preceding the interview, as shown in Exhibit 5-5. For virtually all specific forms of help, the ABAWD and TANF subgroups showed consistently higher percentages receiving help than the non-TANF subgroup.

For all subgroups combined, the most prevalent forms of assistance from friends and family were emotional support (37 percent), money (27 percent), food (27 percent), transportation (23 percent), a place to stay (22 percent), and clothing (18 percent). For each of several shelter-related categories—telephone, utilities, and rent—14 to 15 percent reported receiving help in making payments. For the TANF subgroup, 14 percent also reported receiving help with child care.

Finally, the survey respondents were also asked to indicate whether they had received help from community organizations, neighborhood centers, or religious organizations in the twelve months leading up to the interview. As shown in Exhibit 5-6, more than one-third of each subgroup, and 38 percent combined, reported receiving such help. The TANF subgroup showed the highest percentage, at 44 percent.

By far the most prevalent form of help from private organizations was food from a food bank (25 percent). Other forms of such help included professional counseling or emotional support (8 percent), clothing or clothing vouchers (6 percent), and help paying for utilities (6 percent).

⁶ Once again, the National Survey of America's Families provides comparative national estimates for 1999. Among nonelderly adults (aged 18 to 64) with incomes below 200 percent of the poverty level, 23 percent reported that they had been unable to pay their mortgage, rent, or utility bills at some time during the previous twelve months. See Zedlewski, pp. 5-7.

Exhibit 5-5

Help Received from Friends or Family

| Status During Year Prior to Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | | See Note. |
|---|---------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | Total (696) | |
| Distribution of respondents | | | | | |
| Received the following type of help in the last 12 months: | | | | | |
| Food | 32.2% | 28.6% | 23.2% | 26.7% | |
| Place to stay | 30.0 | 26.7 | 14.8 | 21.6 | *** |
| Clothing | 20.0 | 23.3 | 13.7 | 18.0 | *** |
| Money | 40.0 | 26.4 | 21.5 | 26.8 | *** |
| Child care or help paying for child care | 1.1 | 14.0 | 4.6 | 6.8 | *** |
| Transportation or help paying for transportation | 27.8 | 24.8 | 19.4 | 22.8 | |
| Emotional support | 33.3 | 38.5 | 37.7 | 37.1 | |
| Help paying for phone bill or enabling you to use telephone | 17.8 | 18.6 | 10.9 | 14.7 | ** |
| Help paying for utilities, like electricity, gas, or water | 17.8 | 17.7 | 10.9 | 14.4 | ** |
| Legal aid or help paying for legal aid | 8.9 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 2.8 | *** |
| Help paying for rent | 24.4 | 14.0 | 9.9 | 14.1 | *** |
| Total (received any of the above)^a | 65.6 | 64.3 | 58.1 | 61.6 | |

Base: All respondents

^a Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the subtotal because respondents were asked to indicate all applicable categories.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Exhibit 5-6

Help Received from Private Organizations

| Status During Year Prior to Interview | Non-ABAWD Exitters | | | See Note. | |
|---|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| | ABAWD Exitters (90) | TANF (322) | Non-TANF (284) | | Total (696) |
| Received the following type of help from community organizations, neighborhood centers, or religious organizations in the last 12 months: | | | | | |
| Food from a food bank | 23.3% | 32.6% | 21.1% | 25.2% | *** |
| Food from a soup kitchen | 7.8 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 4.4 | |
| Shelter from an emergency shelter | 5.6 | 4.3 | 2.5 | 3.7 | |
| Help from a crisis center | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 1.6 | |
| Clothing or clothing vouchers | 4.4 | 9.3 | 4.9 | 6.2 | ** |
| Money | 2.2 | 4.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 | |
| Child care or help paying for child care | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 1.8 | *** |
| Transportation or help paying for transportation | 6.7 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 5.2 | |
| Professional counseling or emotional support | 6.7 | 6.8 | 9.5 | 8.1 | |
| Help paying for phone bill or enabling you to use telephone | 0.0 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.5 | |
| Help paying for utilities, like electricity, gas, or water | 3.3 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 5.9 | |
| Legal aid or help paying for legal aid | 4.4 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 1.7 | * |
| Help paying for rent | 1.1 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.4 | |
| Total (received any of the above) ^a | 34.4 | 43.8 | 35.6 | 37.9 | * |

Base: All respondents

a Sum of the preceding entries may exceed the subtotal because respondents were asked to indicate all applicable categories.

Note: Asterisks indicate that one can reject the hypothesis of equal subgroup values, at the 0.10 (*), 0.05 (**), or 0.01 (***) level of significance.

Chapter 6

Concluding Assessment

This final chapter draws conclusions from the findings of both the administrative data analysis and the survey data analysis. Different ways of interpreting the evidence are first described. The final section then compares the post-exit experience of the three subgroups under study—ABAWD, TANF, and non-TANF—in terms of their levels of self-sufficiency, the extent of improvement in their situation since exit, and the degree of hardship and deprivation in their lives.

6.1 Interpreting the Evidence

To interpret the evidence presented in this study, or any other “exit study” or “tracking study” that follows former program participants, one must establish the appropriate standard of comparison, or the benchmark against which to judge the experience of program exiters. The proper choice of benchmark depends on the types of questions to be answered and on the availability of data. The choice deserves careful consideration, as one’s judgment about whether exiters are now “better off” or “worse off” will depend importantly on how one resolves the issue of “compared to what”—or, perhaps more accurately, “compared to when” or “compared to whom.”

This study has typically compared the post-exit situation of each subgroup of food stamp exiters with either: (a) the pre-exit status of the same subgroup on the same outcome measure (if available through the administrative data or survey data); or (b) the post-exit status of the other subgroups. In some instances, we have combined such comparisons into “double-difference” findings—for instance, in comparisons across subgroups as to the percentage change between quarters 0 and 5 in average earnings from covered employment. Another type of comparison presented here, in conjunction with the findings on food security, was to compare the subgroup estimates with estimates on the same outcome measure for the general population of the U.S., the general population of Arizona, and the low-income population nationwide.

These types of comparisons enable us to draw general conclusions about the relative status of the three subgroups, each versus the other two. In particular, as discussed in the next section, conclusions can be drawn on the following major questions:

- which subgroup achieved the highest degree of self-sufficiency?
- which subgroup showed the greatest stability or improvement in its employment situation since exit?
- which subgroup was most at risk of hardship or deprivation?

Before turning to these questions, it is useful to note the types of comparisons that were **not** undertaken in this study, and the rationale for excluding them.

We did not attempt any comparison (through administrative data or general household survey data) of the situation of exiters versus the situation of either current participating food stamp households or never-participating poor or near-poor households of similar demographic characteristics. In our judgment, such groups of households are fundamentally different from exiters—enough to question the meaningfulness of any such comparisons. In particular, those remaining on the program are likely to have greater needs or lower income or resources than those who exited. Conversely, one might argue that those who never entered the program are likely to have lesser needs or greater income or resources than those who entered and then exited.

We also did not attempt to ask survey respondents to indicate whether they now perceived themselves as better or worse off since their food stamp exit in 1997. Such reported perceptions would have relied on the recall of respondents about their earlier situation, over a period of nearly three years for those who exited in early 1997. The likely questionableness of such responses suggested that the survey should focus primarily on objectively-measured outcomes. To the extent that subjective judgments were elicited, it was with respect to the respondent's current situation or their situation during the 12 months preceding the interview.

6.2 Comparing the Subgroup Experiences

We now address the three questions posed earlier with respect to comparisons among the ABAWD, TANF, and non-TANF subgroups of food stamp exiters regarding their self-sufficiency, employment situation since exit, and risk of hardship or deprivation.

Which Subgroup Achieved the Highest Degree of Self-Sufficiency?

To answer this question, one needs to examine the extent to which exiters were able to reduce their dependence on public benefits and to avoid the need for private support.

As to public dependency, it was the ABAWD subgroup that showed the lowest rates of participation in means-tested programs, including food stamps, cash assistance, Medicaid, public housing, and Section 8 housing assistance. To a great extent, however, this reflected the fact that such exiters—because of their personal or household demographics or their program history—had no access to the types of program assistance available to the two non-ABAWD subgroups. For instance, the non-ABAWD subgroups did not face the ABAWD time restrictions on food stamp receipt, and non-ABAWD households with children could obtain family-targeted assistance if necessary.

As to reliance on private support, the ABAWD and TANF subgroups showed higher rates of help received from friends or family than the non-TANF subgroup. The TANF subgroup had the highest rate of help received from community, neighborhood, and religious organizations.

It was thus the non-TANF subgroup that showed the highest degree of self-sufficiency, in terms of independence from both public benefits and private support. Compared to the other subgroups, the non-TANF exiters achieved:

- the lowest rate of help received from family and friends; and

- one of the lower rates of help received from private organizations.

Consistent with this conclusion is that the non-TANF subgroup also showed the lowest level of dissatisfaction with their standard of living. To some degree, these outcomes reflected the more favorable demographic characteristics of the non-TANF exiters, who were comparatively older and more likely to be married and homeowners.

In contrast, the TANF subgroup showed the lowest extent of self-sufficiency. This presumably reflected the combination of their greater income needs (relating to children, versus ABAWDs), the greater availability to them of program support (that is, family-related benefits through cash assistance, child support enforcement, child care assistance, and emergency assistance), and their lower income and resources (most notably, versus the non-TANF subgroup).

Which Subgroup Showed the Greatest Stability or Improvement in Employment Situation Since Exit?

Those in the TANF subgroup experienced the greatest improvement in their employment situation following their food stamp exit. In particular, the TANF subgroup achieved:

- a rate of covered employment as high in follow-up quarter 5 as at exit, whereas the rate dropped markedly for the other subgroups over this period; and
- the highest absolute and proportional increase between quarters 0 and 5 in quarterly earnings from covered employment.

The above-cited pattern of employment was somewhat different in the survey data, however, where the TANF subgroup showed a small post-exit drop in its rate of employment, as did the non-TANF subgroup.

Which Subgroup Was Most at Risk of Hardship or Deprivation?

Among the three subgroups, it was the ABAWD and TANF subgroups that showed the strongest evidence of post-exit hardship and deprivation, in the following respects:

- the highest percentages living with family or friends while paying no rent or partial rent;
- the highest percentages with no health insurance coverage; and
- the highest percentages classified as food insecure with moderate or severe hunger.

Both the ABAWD and TANF subgroups showed high levels of material hardship and help received from friends or family and from private organizations, also indicative of their more frequent inability to meet basic living needs.¹

The high rate of food insecurity with hunger found among ABAWD exiters--34 percent--is noteworthy. This incidence is more than twice the 1999 national rate of 14 percent estimated by USDA for households at or below 50 percent of the poverty level, even though most ABAWDs have incomes above the poverty level. The ABAWD finding highlights the importance of considering (in this and other exit studies) whether exiters who appear self-sufficient, in terms of their reduced reliance on public and private support, are able to avoid hardship and deprivation.

¹ Note that a low degree of help received from family, friends, or private organizations can be interpreted in several ways. On the one hand, it may indicate less serious hardship, and thus lower need for support. On the other hand, the absence of help received may indicate a lack of connectedness to informal support networks that may be important in coping with hardship.

Appendix A

Survey of Arizona Adults Leaving the Food Stamp Program

SURVEY OF ARIZONA ADULTS LEAVING THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

[ASK FOR RESPONDENT BY NAME]

Introduction to the Respondent:

Hello, this is (NAME) calling from Abt Associates. We recently sent you a letter saying that we are working with the Arizona Department of Economic Security on a study to learn more about the experiences of families who have received food stamp benefits within the past couple of years.

We hope that you can help by answering some questions about *your* experiences with the Food Stamp Program and other assistance your household may have received. We will also ask you about employment and training, and other experiences so that DES can provide services that meet the needs of families in Arizona.

Before we begin, I'd like to assure you that all of your answers are strictly confidential. Anything you tell us will not have any effect on your eligibility for benefits, either now or in the future. After your interview is completed, we will send you \$20 to thank you for your participation.

I next need to confirm that I am speaking to the correct individual.

- A. Could you tell me your date of birth? INTERVIEWER: COMPARE DATE GIVEN WITH DOB ON RIB. IF THE DATES ARE THE SAME, GO TO SECTION A. IF THE DATES ARE DIFFERENT, ASK B.
- B. What are the last four digits of your social security number? INTERVIEWER: IF THE LAST FOUR DIGITS GIVEN MATCH THE LAST FOUR DIGITS OF THE SSN FROM THE RIB GO TO SECTION A. IF THE NUMBERS DO NOT MATCH TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW AND READ C.
- C. Thank you for your time. Those are all of the questions I have for you.

Section A: Food Stamp Benefits

I'd like to begin with a few questions about your household's receipt of food stamp benefits since 1997. You may have received these benefits as food stamp coupons or, more recently, through EBT (electronic benefit transfer).

A1. Did your household receive food stamps in (LAST MONTH)?

YES..... 1 (ASK A)

NO.....2 (ASK B,C)

A. When did you most recently apply for food stamp benefits?

____ / 19____ GO TO A2
MONTH YEAR

B. Are you currently in the process of applying to the Food Stamp Program?

YES..... 1

NO..... 2

C. What was the most recent month that your household received food stamps?

____ / 19____
MONTH YEAR

A2. According to food stamp records, you were receiving food stamps in December of 1996 or for part of 1997, but your food stamp benefits ended on (FS EXIT DATE). Please think back to(FS EXIT DATE). What was the main reason that you stopped getting food stamps at that time? PROBE FOR SPECIFICS. RECORD VERBATIM.

INTERVIEWER: IF THE RESPONDENT SAYS THEY NEVER STOPPED RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS IN

A3. INTERVIEWER: SEE FACESHEET. DID R RECEIVE FOOD STAMP BENEFITS AFTER (FS EXIT DATE)?

YES.....(ASK A4)..... 1

A4. DES records also show that after your food stamp benefits ended in (FS EXIT DATE), you again began to receive food stamps in (FS REENTRY DATE). Please think back to that time. What is the main reason that you decided to apply again for food stamps at that time? PROBE FOR SPECIFICS. RECORD VERBATIM.

Section B: Household Composition and Child Care

Now I'd like to ask some questions about your household.

B1. What was your marital status when you left the Food Stamp Program in (FS EXIT DATE)? Were you...

- married and living with your spouse,..... (GO TO B2)..... 1
- separated or living apart from your (husband/wife),..... 2
- divorced,..... 3
- widowed, or..... 4
- never married?..... 5
- REFUSED..... 7

B1a. At that time were you living with boyfriend/girlfriend/partner?

- YES..... 1
- NO..... 2
- REFUSED 7

B2. Has there been any change in your living situation since you left the Food Stamp Program in (FS EXIT DATE)?

- YES..... 1
- NO.....(SKIP TO B4)..... 2

B3. What is your current marital status? Are you currently...

- married and living with your spouse,..... (GO TO B4)..... 1
- separated or living apart from your (husband/wife),..... 2
- divorced,..... 3
- widowed, or..... 4
- never married?..... 5
- REFUSED..... 7

B3a. Are you living with a boyfriend/girlfriend/partner?

- YES..... 1
- NO..... 2
- REFUSED 7

B4. Besides yourself, how many people live in your household? _____

(INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF B4 = 0, THEN GO TO C.1.)

B5. Please give me the first names of all the people who currently live in your household. Lets begin with any other adults in your household, then list children. ENTER NAMES, THEN ASK A THROUGH H FOR EACH PERSON, AS APPROPRIATE.

| NAME: | PERSON #1 | PERSON #2 | PERSON #3 |
|---|---|---|--|
| What is (NAME's) relationship to you? | SPOUSE 01 BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER..... 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD..... 03 STEPCHILD 04 GRANDCHILD..... 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT.... 10 SIBLING 11 NEPHEW/NIECE.... 12 COUSIN 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW..... 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) | SPOUSE 01 BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER..... 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD..... 03 STEPCHILD 04 GRANDCHILD..... 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT.... 10 SIBLING 11 NEPHEW/NIECE.... 12 COUSIN 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW..... 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) | SPOUSE 01 BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER..... 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD..... 03 STEPCHILD 04 GRANDCHILD..... 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT.... 10 SIBLING 11 NEPHEW/NIECE.... 12 COUSIN 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) |
| What is (NAME's) date of birth? | ___/___/___ | ___/___/___ | ___/___/___ |
| ASK C AND D FOR EACH PERSON 15 YEARS OR OLDER. | | | |
| Last month, did (NAME) work at any job for 15+ hours per week? | YES (ASK D)..... 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) | YES (ASK D)..... 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) | YES (ASK D)..... 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) |
| IF YES: Last month, how much did (NAME) earn at all jobs, before taxes and other deductions? PROBE: What is your best estimate? | \$ _____ , _____ | \$ _____ , _____ | \$ _____ , _____ |

| ASK E-H FOR EACH CHILD 12 YEARS OR YOUNGER. | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| E. Is (CHILD'S NAME) in a <u>regular</u> | YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 | YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 | YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| child care arrangement, for at least part of the day? Please include any <u>regular</u> arrangement with a friend, relative, or formal program. | or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4 | or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4 | or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4 |
| F. What type of child care arrangement is this? | CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME.....05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME.....06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96 | CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME.....05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME.....06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96 | CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME.....05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME.....06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96 |
| G. About how many hours per week is (CHILD-S NAME) usually in child care? | Less than 5 hours/week 1 5 to 20 hours/week2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week4 More than 50 hours/week5 DK8 REF7 | Less than 5 hours/week 1 5 to 20 hours/week 2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week 3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week 4 More than 50 hours/week 5 DK 8 REF 7 | Less than 5 hours/week1 5 to 20 hours/week2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week4 More than 50 hours/week4 DK8 REF7 |
| H. How satisfied are you with the <u>quality</u> of (CHILD-S NAME)'s child care? Would you say... | Very satisfied1 Satisfied2 Dissatisfied3 Very dissatisfied4 DK8 REF7 | Very satisfied1 Satisfied2 Dissatisfied3 Very dissatisfied4 DK8 REF7 | Very satisfied1 Satisfied2 Dissatisfied3 Very dissatisfied4 DK8 REF7 |

| NAME: | PERSON #4 | PERSON #5 | PERSON #6 |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| A. What is (NAME-S) | SPOUSE..... 01 | SPOUSE01 | SPOUSE..... |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| relationship to you? | BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD 03 STEPCHILD 04 GRANDCHILD 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD 06 PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE 09 GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT 10 SIBLING 11 NEPHEW/NIECE 12 COUSIN 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) 15 | BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD 03 STEPCHILD 04 GRANDCHILD 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD 06 PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE 09 GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT 10 SIBLING 11 NEPHEW/NIECE 12 COUSIN 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) 15 | BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD 03 STEPCHILD 04 GRANDCHILD 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD 06 PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE 09 GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT 10 SIBLING 11 NEPHEW/NIECE 12 COUSIN 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) 15 |
| B. What is (NAME)'s date of birth? | ____ / ____ / ____ | ____ / ____ / ____ | ____ / ____ / ____ |
| ASK C AND D FOR EACH PERSON 15 YEARS OR OLDER. | | | |
| C. Last month, did (NAME) work at any job for pay? | YES (ASK D) 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) | YES (ASK D) 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) | YES (ASK D) NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON or Question B6) |
| D. IF YES: Last month, how much did (NAME) earn at all jobs, before taxes and other deductions? PROBE: What is your best estimate? | \$ _____ , _____ | \$ _____ , _____ | \$ _____ , _____ |

ASK E-H FOR EACH CHILD 12 YEARS OR YOUNGER.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>E. Is (CHILD-S NAME) in a <u>regular</u> child care arrangement, for at least part of the day? Please include any <u>regular</u> arrangement with a friend, relative, or formal program.</p> | <p>YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4</p> | <p>YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4</p> | <p>YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4</p> |
| <p>F. What type of child care arrangement is this?</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> |
| <p>G. About how many hours per week is (CHILD-S NAME) usually in child care?</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week1 5 to 20 hours/week2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week4 More than 50 hours/week5 DK8 REF7</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week 1 5 to 20 hours/week 2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week 3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week 4 More than 50 hours/week 5 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week 1 5 to 20 hours/week 2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week 3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week 4 More than 50 hours/week 5 DK 8 REF 7</p> |
| <p>H. How satisfied are you with the <u>quality</u> of (CHILD-S NAME)'s child care? Would you say...</p> | <p>Very satisfied 1 Satisfied 2 Dissatisfied 3 Very dissatisfied 4 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Very satisfied 1 Satisfied 2 Dissatisfied 3 Very dissatisfied 4 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Very satisfied 1 Satisfied 2 Dissatisfied 3 Very dissatisfied 4 DK 8 REF 7</p> |

| NAME: | PERSON #7 | PERSON #8 | PERSON #9 |
|--|---|---|---|
| A. What is (NAME-s) relationship to you? | SPOUSE..... 01 BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD 03 STEPCCHILD 04 GRANDCHILD 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD..... 06 PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE 09 GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT 10 SIBLING..... 11 NEPHEW/NIECE 12 COUSIN..... 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) 15 | SPOUSE 01 BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER..... 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD..... 03 STEPCCHILD..... 04 GRANDCHILD..... 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD 06 PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE..... 09 GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT..... 10 SIBLING 11 NEPHEW/NIECE..... 12 COUSIN 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER)..... 15 | SPOUSE..... 01 BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER 02 NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD 03 STEPCCHILD 04 GRANDCHILD 05 OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD..... 06 PARENT 07 STEPPARENT 08 AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE 09 GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT 10 SIBLING..... 11 NEPHEW/NIECE 12 COUSIN..... 13 OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) 15 |
| B. What is (NAME)s date of birth? | _____ / _____ / _____ | _____ / _____ / _____ | _____ / _____ / _____ |
| ASK C AND D FOR EACH PERSON 15 YEARS OR OLDER. | | | |
| C. Last month, did (NAME) work at any job for pay? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON..... 2 or Question B6) | YES (ASK A) 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON..... 2 or Question B6) |
| D. IF YES: Last month, how much did (NAME) earn at all jobs, before taxes and other deductions? PROBE: What is your best estimate? | \$ _____ , _____ | \$ _____ , _____ | \$ _____ , _____ |

ASK E-H FOR EACH CHILD 12 YEARS OR YOUNGER.

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>E. Is (CHILD-S NAME) in a <u>regular</u> child care arrangement, for at least part of the day? Please include any <u>regular</u> arrangement with a friend, relative, or formal program.</p> | <p>YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) DK 3 REF.....4</p> | <p>YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON2 or Question B6) DK3 REF4</p> | <p>YES1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON.....2 or Question B6) DK.....3 REF.....4</p> |
| <p>F. What type of child care arrangement is this?</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME.....05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START.....08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM.....09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME.....05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM.....09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPARENT/PARTNER.....01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE.....04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> |
| <p>G. About how many hours per week is (CHILD-S NAME) usually in child care?</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week1 5 to 20 hours/week2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week4 More than 50 hours/week5 DK8 REF.....7</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week 1 5 to 20 hours/week 2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week 3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week 4 More than 50 hours/week 5 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week1 5 to 20 hours/week2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week4 More than 50 hours/week5 DK.....8 REF7</p> |
| <p>H. How satisfied are you with the <u>quality</u> of (CHILD-S NAME)'s child care? Would you say...</p> | <p>Very satisfied.....1 Satisfied2 Dissatisfied3 Very dissatisfied4 DK8 REF.....7</p> | <p>Very satisfied..... 1 Satisfied 2 Dissatisfied 3 Very dissatisfied 4 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Very satisfied1 Satisfied2 Dissatisfied.....3 Very dissatisfied.....4 DK.....8 REF7</p> |

| NAMES: | PERSON #10 | PERSON #11 | PERSON #12 |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| A. What is (NAME-s) relationship to you? | SPOUSE..... 01 | SPOUSE01 | SPOUSE..... 01 |
| | BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER 02 | BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER.....02 | BOYFRIEND/GIRLFRIEND/ PARTNER 02 |
| | NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD 03 | NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD.....03 | NATURAL OR ADOPTED CHILD 03 |
| | STEPCHILD 04 | STEPCHILD.....04 | STEPCHILD 04 |
| | GRANDCHILD 05 | GRANDCHILD.....05 | GRANDCHILD 05 |
| | OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD..... 06 | OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD06 | OTHER CUSTODIAL CHILD/FOSTER CHILD..... 06 |
| | PARENT 07 | PARENT07 | PARENT 07 |
| | STEPPARENT 08 | STEPPARENT08 | STEPPARENT 08 |
| | AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE..... 09 | AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE.....09 | AUNT/UNCLE/GREAT- AUNT/GREAT-UNCLE..... 09 |
| | GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT 10 | GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT.....10 | GRANDPARENT/GREAT- GRANDPARENT 10 |
| | SIBLING..... 11 | SIBLING11 | SIBLING..... 11 |
| | NEPHEW/NIECE 12 | NEPHEW/NIECE.....12 | NEPHEW/NIECE 12 |
| | COUSIN..... 13 | COUSIN13 | COUSIN..... 13 |
| | OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 | OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW14 | OTHER RELATIVE OR IN- LAW 14 |
| | NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) 15 | NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER).....15 | NON-RELATIVE (INCLUDING ROOMER/BOARDER) 15 |
| B. What is (NAME)s date of birth? | ____ / ____ / ____ | ____ / ____ / ____ | ____ / ____ / ____ |
| ASK C AND D FOR EACH PERSON 15 YEARS OR OLDER. | | | |
| C. Last month, did (NAME) work at any job for pay? | YES (ASK D) 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON..... 2 or Question B6) | YES (ASK D).....1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON2 or Question B6) | YES (ASK D) 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON..... 2 or Question B6) |
| D. IF YES: Last month, how much did (NAME) earn at all jobs, before taxes and other deductions? PROBE: What is your best estimate? | \$ _____ , _____ | \$ _____ , _____ | \$ _____ , _____ |

ASK E-H FOR EACH CHILD 12 YEARS OR YOUNGER.

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>E. Is (CHILD-S NAME) in a <u>regular</u> child care arrangement, for at least part of the day? Please include any <u>regular</u> arrangement with a friend, relative, or formal program.</p> | <p>YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4</p> | <p>YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4</p> | <p>YES 1 NO (GO TO NEXT PERSON 2 or Question B6) DK 3 REF 4</p> |
| <p>F. What type of child care arrangement is this?</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> | <p>CHILD-S OTHER PARENT/STEPPARENT/PARTNER01 CHILD-S GRANDPARENT/GREAT GRANDPARENT02 CHILD-S SIBLING03 CHILD-S OTHER RELATIVE04 BABYSITTER OR NONRELATIVE IN CHILD-S HOME05 FAMILY DAY CARE OR NONRELATIVE IN ANOTHER HOME06 PRESCHOOL, NURSERY SCHOOL, OR DAY CARE CENTER07 HEAD START08 EXTENDED-DAY, BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM09 OTHER (SPECIFY)96</p> |
| <p>G. About how many hours per week is (CHILD-S NAME) usually in child care?</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week 1 5 to 20 hours/week 2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week 3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week 4 More than 50 hours/week 5 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week 1 5 to 20 hours/week 2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week 3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week 4 More than 50 hours/week 5 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Less than 5 hours/week 1 5 to 20 hours/week 2 Between 21 and 40 hours/week 3 Between 41 and 50 hours/week 4 More than 50 hours/week 5 DK 8 REF 7</p> |
| <p>H. How satisfied are you with the <u>quality</u> of (CHILD-S NAME)'s child care? Would you say...</p> | <p>Very satisfied 1 Satisfied 2 Dissatisfied 3 Very dissatisfied 4 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Very satisfied 1 Satisfied 2 Dissatisfied 3 Very dissatisfied 4 DK 8 REF 7</p> | <p>Very satisfied 1 Satisfied 2 Dissatisfied 3 Very dissatisfied 4 DK 8 REF 7</p> |

INTERVIEWER: IF ALL PERSONS IDENTIFIED IN B5 ARE ADULTS OR ALL CHILDREN IDENTIFIED IN B5 ARE OLDER THAN 12 OR IF ALL ANSWERS TO B5E ARE NO, THEN SKIP TO C1

B6. Now think about all the child care arrangements and programs you use regularly for (CHILD 1)/(CHILD 2)/all your children age 12 and younger) while you worked, were in school, or looked for work. How much did you pay for all child care arrangements and programs used in the last month?

\$ _____ .00

NO PAYMENT IN LAST MONTH OR WEEK (SKIP TO B8)

B6a. Is that amount...

Per week 1

Per month 2

B7. Is the amount of money you pay for any of your children's child care arrangements determined by how much money you earn?

[IF NECESSARY, PROBE: Do you pay a sliding fee amount for any of these arrangements?]

YES 1

NO..... 2

B8. Does anyone else pay for all or part of the cost of any of your children's care? By this I mean a government agency, your employer, or someone outside your household?

YES 1

NO.....(GO TO B10) 2

B9. Who or what agency helps to pay for child care?

| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|
| a. DES Childcare Administration | 1 | 2 |
| b. Your employer..... | 1 | 2 |
| c. A non-custodial parents | 1 | 2 |
| d. Some other individual, agency or organization..... (SPECIFY) _____ | 1 | 2 |

B10. At any time since (FS EXIT DATE), did you have to quit a job, quit school, a job search, or a training activity because you had problems arranging child care or keeping a child care arrangement?

YES 1

NO..... 2

B11. At any time since (FS EXIT DATE), did you not take a new job or start a training program because you had problems arranging child care or keeping a child care arrangement?

YES 1

NO..... 2

Section C: Employment

These next questions are about employment.

C1. When you left the Food Stamp Program in (FS EXIT DATE), were you working at a job for pay, either full-time or part-time?

- YES..... 1
- NO..... 2

C2. Are you currently working at a job for pay, either full-time or part-time?

- YES..... 1
- NO.....(SKIP TO C4)..... 2

INTERVIEWER: ASK C3 IF YES TO BOTH C1 AND C2.

C3. Is your current job the same job you had when you left the Food Stamp Program in (FS EXIT DATE)?

- YES.....(SKIP TO C6)..... 1
- NO.....(SKIP TO C6)..... 2

C4. What is the main reason that you are not working at this time? RECORD VERBATIM. CODE AT END OF INTERVIEW.

| | |
|--|----|
| NEED/WANT TO STAY HOME WITH CHILDREN..... | 01 |
| ILLNESS/HEALTH PROBLEMS/DISABILITY | 02 |
| SUBSTANCE ABUSE..... | 03 |
| IN SCHOOL | 04 |
| TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS..... | 05 |
| PROBLEM WITH AVAILABILITY OF THE KIND OF CHILD CARE..... | 06 |
| PROBLEMS WITH THE QUALITY OF THE CHILD CARE..... | 07 |
| PROBLEMS WITH FINDING CHILD CARE WITHIN PROXIMITY TO R-S | 08 |
| PROBLEMS WITH COST OF CHILD CARE..... | 09 |
| UNABLE TO FIND A GOOD JOB..... | 10 |
| NO WORK IN LOCAL GEOGRAPHIC AREA..... | 11 |
| NO JOBS IN LINE OF WORK..... | 12 |
| LACKS NECESSARY SCHOOLING. TRAINING, SKILLS, EXPERIENCE | 13 |
| EMPLOYERS THINK RESPONDENT IS TOO YOUNG OR TOO OLD..... | 14 |
| WORKING DOESN'T PAY ENOUGH (CAN GET MORE MONEY BY STAYING ON WELFARE) | 15 |
| NEED TO CARE FOR SICK RELATIVE..... | 16 |
| DIFFICULTY GETTING ALONG WITH OTHERS IN WORKPLACE..... | 17 |
| DIFFICULTY READING/WRITING/SPEAKING ENGLISH | 18 |
| OTHER (SPECIFY) _____..... | 96 |

HOI

C.4.A. You have just told me the main reason that you are not working at this time. There are many other reasons that people feel they are not able to work. I'd like you to tell me whether each of the following reasons is very important, somewhat important, or not at all important as a reason why you are not working at this time.

| | <u>Very important</u> | <u>Somewhat important</u> | <u>Not at all important</u> | N/A |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| a. You need or want to stay home with your children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. You or your children are ill, have health problems, or are disabled..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. You have a substance abuse problem..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. You are in school or a training program..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. You have transportation problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. You cannot afford to pay for child care..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g. It's difficult to find the kind of child care that you..... want..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h. It is difficult to find quality day care | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| i. It is difficult to find child care near enough to where you live or work..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| j. You have not been able to find a job..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| k. There is no work in your local geographic area..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| l. You need to take care of a sick relative..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| m. There are no jobs in your line of work..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| n. You lack the necessary schooling, training, skills or experience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| o. Employers think you are too old..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| p. Employers think you are too young..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| q. Working does not pay enough. You can get more money by staying on welfare | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| r. You have difficulty getting along with others..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| s. You have difficulty reading, writing or speaking English.... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

C.4.B. Are there any other important reasons that you are not working at this time that you have not already told me about? PROBE FOR SPECIFIC REASON(S).

C5. Since (FS EXIT DATE), have you worked for pay at any job? Please include any job that you

were paid for, including babysitting, housekeeping, or temporary work.

YES..... (ASK A) 1

NO..... (SKIP TO SECTION D)..... 2

A. What is the main reason that you left your most recent job?

SKIP TO C7

C6. How many jobs are you currently working?

_____ NUMBER OF JOBS

[ASK ITEMS C.7 THROUGH C.13 FOR EACH CURRENT JOB OR FOR R-S MOST RECENT JOB.]

| | JOB #1 | JOB #2 |
|--|---|---|
| C7. [IF CURRENTLY WORKING AT MORE THAN ONE JOB: Let's begin with the job where you work the most hours.] [IF NOT WORKING: Let's talk about your most recent job.] | | |
| A. What (is/was) your job title or position? | _____ | _____ |
| B. What kind of work (do/did) you do at this job? What (are/were) your typical daily activities? | _____ _____ _____ _____ | _____ _____ _____ _____ |
| C8. When did you <u>start</u> working at this job? | _____/19____ MONTH YEAR | _____/19____ MONTH YEAR |
| C9. When you first started this job, how many hours per week did you (usually) work? | _____HOURS/WEEK | _____HOURS/WEEK |
| C10.A How much did you earn at this job when you began working there? B. IF NECESSARY: Is that? | \$____, _____. ____ Per hour 1 Per week.....2 Every two weeks3 Per month4 Per year5 Other (SPECIFY)6 | \$____, _____. ____ Per hour 1 Per week.....2 Every two weeks3 Per month4 Per year5 Other (SPECIFY)6 |
| C. Is that before or after taxes and other deductions? | BEFORE 1 AFTER 2 | BEFORE 1 AFTER 2 |
| C11. How many hours per week (do you usually work at this job <u>now</u> /were you working when you left this job)? | _____HOURS/WEEK | _____HOURS/WEEK |
| C12. How much (are/were) you earning at this job (now/when you left it)? | \$____, _____. ____ Per hour 1 Per week.....2 Every two weeks3 Per month4 Per year5 Other (SPECIFY)6 | \$____, _____. ____ Per hour 1 Per week.....2 Every two weeks3 Per month4 Per year5 Other (SPECIFY)6 |
| A. Is that before or after taxes and other deductions? | BEFORE 1 AFTER 2 | BEFORE 1 AFTER 2 |
| C13. INTERVIEWER: IF R CURRENTLY WORKING: SEE C6. DOES R HAVE MORE THAN ONE JOB? | YES (ASK C7-C12A FOR #2).....1 NO.....2 | |

Section D: Employment Benefits and Health Insurance

- D1. INTERVIEWER: SEE C2. IS R CURRENTLY WORKING?
- YES..... 1
- NO (SKIP TO D4) 2
- D2. Do you receive any of the following benefits at your current job?
- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|
| a. Paid sick days?..... | 1 | 2 |
| b. Paid vacation days?..... | 1 | 2 |
| c. Paid holidays? | 1 | 2 |
| d. Dental benefits? | 1 | 2 |
| e. Assistance with paying for child care? | 1 | 2 |
| f. Does your employer offer a pension plan or other retirement benefits (that you are eligible for)?..... | 1 | 2 |
- D3. Right now, do you have any health insurance coverage through your job?
- YES..... 1
- NO (GO TO D4)..... 2
- A. Does this health insurance cover just you or others in your family also?
- RESPONDENT ONLY..... 1
- FAMILY ALSO 2
- B. Do you have to pay any of the cost of this health insurance?
- YES..... 1
- NO (SKIP TO D4) 2
- C. How much do you pay? IF NECESSARY: Is that per week, every two weeks, or every month?
- \$_____00
- PER WEEK 1
- EVERY 2 WEEKS 2
- EVERY MONTH..... 3
- PER CO-PAYMENT 4
- OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ 5
- D4. Are you enrolled in (any/any other) health insurance plan or program, including AHCCCS (This is the state's Medicaid program)?

YES..... 1
 NO(SKIP TO SECTION E) 2

D5. Do you receive health insurance through... (CIRCLE YES OR NO FOR EACH)

| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|
| a. AHCCCS? (This is the state's Medicaid program)..... | 1 | 2 |
| b. Medicare? (This is a federal program you would get through Social Security or SSI)..... | 1 | 2 |
| c. Other health insurance programs that you pay for? | 1 | 2 |
| d. Any <u>other</u> kind of health insurance program? (SPECIFY) _____..... | 1 | 2 |

Section E: Education and Training

E1. I am going to read you a list of education and training activities that you may be currently participating in. Please tell me if you are doing any of the following activities. Do you attend (ITEM)?

E2. In what month and year did you start this program?

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p>a. a GED or high school equivalency program , or regular high school classes?</p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>b. Literacy or basic education classes? <i>These classes offer training in basic reading and math skills.</i></p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>c. An ESL or English as a Second Language course?</p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>d. Community college or college classes? <i>These classes include courses at community, two-year, and four-year colleges that are taken to earn a degree.</i></p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>e. Classroom training for a specific job, trade, or occupation? <i>These are job skills, vocational education, or trade school programs to prepare you for a specific job; it does not include high school vocational programs.</i></p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>f. On-the-job training offered through your employer? OJT, or on-the-job training, is a position in which your employer provides training in a particular skill while you work. These are usually paid work-based learning programs. [Part of the training may be paid by another agency such as JTPA.]</p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>g. A Job Club or a job readiness workshop? These programs offer classes or group meetings where you learn how to apply for a job, prepare a resume, fill out a job application, behave in an interview, and keep a job.</p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>h. An unpaid work experience program? <i>This is a special program that gives you an unpaid job that gives you work experience while you receive cash assistance.</i></p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2....</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>i. Are there any other educational or training activities or employment programs that you are taking part in at this time? (SPECIFY) _____ _____</p> | <p>YES 1 NO 2</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> 19 <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|---|------------|-----------|
| E3. | Do you have... (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY) | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
| | a. A trade license or certificate?..... | 1 | | 2 |
| | b. A GED certificate?..... (IF YES, SKIP TO E4) | 1 | | 2 |
| | c. A high school diploma? (IF YES, SKIP TO E5) | 1 | | 2 |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| E4. | What is the highest grade or level of regular school you have ever completed? | | | |
| | GRADE 8 OR LESS | 1 | | |
| | NINTH GRADE/FRESHMAN | 2 | | |
| | TENTH GRADE/SOPHOMORE..... | 3 | | |
| | ELEVENTH GRADE/JUNIOR..... | 4 | | |
| | TWELFTH GRADE/SENIOR OR HIGHER..... | 5 | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| E5. | Have you earned any college credits toward an Associates or Bachelors degree? | | | |
| | YES (GO TO E6) | 1 | | |
| | NO..... (GO TO SECTION F) | 2 | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|---|------------|-----------|
| E6. | Do you have... | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
| | a. An Associates degree?..... | 1 | | 2 |
| | b. A Bachelors degree? (IF YES, ASK C) | | | |
| | (IF NO, GO TO SECTION F)..... | 1 | | 2 |
| | c. A graduate degree?..... | 1 | | 2 |

Section F: Household Income and Benefits

These next questions are about sources of income and other assistance that your household may have received last month.

F1. In (LAST MONTH), did you or anyone else in your household, including children, receive (INCOME SOURCE)?

INTERVIEWER: IF YES TO AN INCOME SOURCE, ASK F1A.

F1A. How much did you and other household members receive in (LAST MONTH)

| INCOME SOURCE | RECEIVED LAST MONTH? | F1A. AMOUNT LAST MONTH |
|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| a. unemployment insurance? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| b. workers compensation? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| c. cash assistance through TANF? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| d. Supplemental Security Income or SSI? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| e. General Assistance? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| f. child support payments, either court-ordered or through an informal arrangement with the other parent? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| g. alimony payments? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| h. Social Security, including disability benefits? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| i. any other retirement, pension, or disability benefits, public or private? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| j. rental income or payments from roomers or boarders? | YES (ASK A)..... 1 NO 2 | \$ _____ |
| | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|----------|
| k. any other income? (<i>SPECIFY:</i>) | YES (<i>ASK A</i>)..... 1 | \$ _____ |
| | NO 2 | |

F2. In (LAST MONTH), did you or anyone in your household receive WIC (Women, Infants, and Children Program) benefits?

- YES 1
- NO 2

F3. [IF A CHILD OF AGES 6-17 IN HOUSEHOLD, (SEE B5B) ASK F3]

In (LAST MONTH), did any school-aged child in this household receive a free or reduced-price breakfast or lunch at school?

- YES 1
- NO 2

The federal government has a special rule that allows working people who make less than about \$29,000 a year to take advantage of something called the Earned Income Tax Credit, or EITC. They can claim the Earned Income Tax Credit by filling out a special form called Schedule EIC when they fill out their income taxes, or they can fill out a special form with their employer.

F4. In the last year did you receive any income from the Earned Income Tax Credit OR EITC?

- YES (ASK A)..... 1
- NO (SKIP TO SECTION G)..... 2

A. How much EITC did you receive last year?

\$_____.00 last year

Section G: Family Well-Being and Support

Now I'd like to ask some questions about your household circumstances.

- G1. What best describes your living arrangement last month., did you...
- own your own home, (SKIP TO G3) 01
 - rent your home or apartment, 02
 - live with family or friends and not pay rent, 03
 - live with family or friends and pay part of the rent..... 04
 - live in a group shelter, ...(SKIP TO G5) 05
 - live on the street, or .(SKIP TO G5) 06
 - live in some other arrangement? (SPECIFY)
..... 96

- G2. Do you live in public housing?
- YES..... 1
 - NO 2

- G2a. Do you pay less rent because the government pays for part of it through Section 8 housing?
- YES..... 1
 - NO 2

- G3. All together, in (LAST MONTH), what did your household spend on housing? Include rent or mortgage and, if applicable, home insurance and property taxes.
PROMPT: Your best estimate is fine.

\$ _____ .00

- G4. Did that amount in (LAST MONTH) include any utilities, such as gas, heat, or electricity?
- YES..... (GO TO G5)..... 1
 - NO (ASK A)..... 2
 - DON'T KNOW (GO TO G5)..... 8

- A. How much did your household pay for utilities in (LAST MONTH)? Please include all utilities such as gas, heat, and electricity. PROMPT: Your best estimate is fine.

\$ _____ .00 TOTAL UTILITIES

DON'T KNOW 998

G5. In the last 12 months, has there been a time when your household...

| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>REF</u> | <u>DK</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| a. Was unable to pay the full amount of the rent or mortgage? | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| b. Was evicted from your home or apartment for not paying the rent or mortgage? | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| c. Did not pay the full amount of the gas, oil, or electricity bills? | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| d. Had service turned off by the gas or electric company, or oil company would not deliver oil? | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| e. Had service disconnected by the telephone company because payments were not made? | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| f. Had someone in your household who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but couldn't go? | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| g. Had someone who needed to see a dentist but couldn't go? | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |

Now I would like to ask you about help you may have received in the last 12 months from friends or family.

G6. In the last 12 months, have you or your children received any of the following types of help from friends, family, or the other parent of a child in the household?

| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>REF</u> | <u>DK</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| a. Food | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| b. A place to stay (when you needed one) | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| c. Clothing | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| d. Money | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| e. Child care or help paying child care | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| f. Transportation or help paying for transportation | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| g. Emotional support | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| h. Help paying your phone bill or enabling you to use a telephone | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| i. Help paying your for utilities, like electricity, gas, or water | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| j. Legal aid or help paying for legal aid | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| k. Help paying for your rent | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| l. Any other kind of help? (SPECIFY) _____ | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |

Now I would like to ask you about help you may have received in the last 12 months from other organizations, not counting friends and family or the government.

G7. In the last 12 months, have you or your children received any of the following types of help from community organizations, neighborhood centers, or religious organizations?

| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>REF</u> | <u>DK</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| a. Food from a food bank..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| b. Food from a soup kitchen..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| c. Shelter from an emergency shelter..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| d. Help from a crisis center..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| e. Clothing or clothing vouchers..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| f. Money..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| g. Child care or help paying child care..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| h. Transportation or help paying for transportation..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| i. Professional counseling or emotional support..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| j. Help paying your phone bill or enabling you to use a telephone..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| k. Help paying for utilities, like electricity, gas, or water..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| l. Legal aid or help paying for legal aid..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| m. Help paying for your rent..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |
| n. Any other kind of help? (SPECIFY) _____..... | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 |

G8. In the last 12 months, did you place your (child/children) in foster care or with friends or family because you could no longer afford to take care of them on your own?

| | |
|-----|--------|
| Yes |1 |
| No |2 |

G9. Next I'd like to ask you how satisfied you are with the various things that affect your standard of living. How satisfied are you with (ITEM)? Would you say that you are very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

| | VERY SATISFIED | SATISFIED | DIS- SATISFIED | VERY DIS- SATISFIED | DON'T KNOW |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| a. Your financial situation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| b. Your housing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| c. Your health | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| d. Your personal medical care | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| e. Your personal clothing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| f. Your personal furniture | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| g. Recreational activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| h. Your overall standard of living | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 |

G10. In general, how do your family finances usually work out at the end of the month? Is there...

| | |
|--|---|
| some money left over,..... | 1 |
| just enough to make ends meet, or | 2 |
| not enough money to make ends meet?..... | 3 |
| REFUSED | 7 |
| DON'T KNOW | 8 |

Section H: Food Security

H1. These next questions are about the food eaten in your household. [IF ONE PERSON IN HOUSEHOLD, USE **AI** IN PARENTHETICALS, OTHERWISE, USE **AWE**]

Which of these statements best describes the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months, that is, since (CURRENT MONTH) of last year:

- (I/we) always have enough to eat and the kinds of food (I/we) want 1 GO TO H2
- (I/we) have enough to eat but NOT always the KINDS OF FOOD (I/we) want 2 ASK B
- sometimes (I/we) don't have ENOUGH to eat..... 3 ASK A
- OFTEN (I/we) don't have enough to eat 4 ASK A
- DK or Refused5 GO TO H2

A. Here are some reasons why people don't always have enough to eat. For each one, please tell me if that is a reason why YOU don't always have enough to eat. [READ ITEM] Is this a reason why you don't always have enough to eat?

| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>DK</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Not enough money for food | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Too hard to get to the store..... | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| On a diet | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| No working stove available | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Not able to cook or eat because of health problems..... | 1 | 2 | 8 |

SKIP TO QUESTION H2

B. Here are some reasons why people don't always have the kinds of food they want or need. For each one, please tell me if that is a reason why YOU don't always have the kinds of food you want or need. [READ ITEM]. Is this a reason why you don't always have the kind of food you want or need?

| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>DK</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Not enough money for food | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Too hard to get to the store..... | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| On a diet | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Kinds of food (I/we) want not available..... | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Good quality food not available | 1 | 2 | 8 |

[IF SINGLE ADULT IN HOUSEHOLD, USE **AI,@AMY,@AND AYOU@** IN PARENTHETICALS;
OTHERWISE, USE **AWE,@AOUR,@AND AYOUR HOUSEHOLD.@**]

H2. Now I'm going to read you several statements that people have made about their food situation. For these sta

The first statement is **A(I/We)** worried whether (my/our) food would run out before (I/we) got money to buy more.@ Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3
- DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED 4

H3. The food that (I/we) bought just didn't last, and (I/we) didn't have money to get more. Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3
- DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED 4

H4. (I/we) couldn't afford to eat balanced meals. Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3
- DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED 4

[IF CHILDREN UNDER 18 IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK H5-7; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO H8.]

H5. (I/we) relied on only a few kinds of low-cost food to feed (my/our) child/the children because (I was/we were) running out of money to buy food. Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3
- DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED 4

H6. (I/We) couldn't feed (my/our) child/the children a balanced meal, because (I/we) couldn't afford that. Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3

- DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED4
- H7. (My/Our child was/The children were) not eating enough because (I/we) just couldn't afford enough food. Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?
- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE2
- NEVER TRUE3
- DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED4
- H8. In the last 12 months, since last (CURRENT MONTH), did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?
- YES (ASK A) 1
- NO (GO TO H9).....2
- DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED3
- A. How often did this happen--almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?
- ALMOST EVERY MONTH..... 1
- SOME MONTHS BUT NOT EVERY MONTH2
- ONLY 1 OR 2 MONTHS 3
- DON'T KNOW4
- H9. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?
- YES 1
- NO2
- DON'T KNOW3
- H10. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?
- YES 1
- NO2
- DON'T KNOW3

H11. In the last 12 months, did you lose weight because you didn't have enough money for food?

- YES 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW 3

H12. In the last 12 months, did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

- YES (ASK A) 1
- NO (GO TO H13)..... 2
- DON'T KNOW (GO TO H13)..... 3

A. How often did this happen--almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

- ALMOST EVERY MONTH..... 1
- SOME MONTHS BUT NOT EVERY MONTH 2
- ONLY 1 OR 2 MONTHS 3
- DON'T KNOW 4

[IF CHILDREN UNDER 18 IN HOUSEHOLD, ASK H13-16; OTHERWISE SKIP TO SECTION I.]

H13. The next questions are about the children living in the household who are under 18 years old. You may find some of the following questions sensitive. I want to remind you that all of the information you give will remain confidential and in answering these questions you will help the food stamp program better understand the needs of families and children in Arizona.

In the last 12 months, since (current month) of last year, did you ever cut the size of (your child's/any of the children's) meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

- YES 1

NO2
 DON'T KNOW3

H14. In the last 12 months, did (CHILD'S NAME/any of the children) ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

YES 1
 NO (GO TO H15)..... 2
 DON'T KNOW (GO TO H15).....3

A. How often did this happen--almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

ALMOST EVERY MONTH..... 1
 SOME MONTHS BUT NOT EVERY MONTH 2
 ONLY 1 OR 2 MONTHS 3
 DON'T KNOW4

H15. In the last 12 months, (was your child/were the children) ever hungry but you just couldn't afford more food?

YES 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW3

H16. In the last 12 months, did (your child/any of the children) ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

YES 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW3

Section I: Contact Information

Those are all of the questions I have for you. Thank you very much for your participation. In order to send you your check for \$20, I need to confirm or update your address.

II. Is (READ ADDRESS FROM RIB LABEL) your current address?

- YES 1
- NO 2

IF NO: Please give me your correct address. READ BACK THE ADDRESS INFORMATION TO R.
SPELL THE WORDS WHEN NECESSARY.

STREET

CITY STATE ZIP

PHONE: (_____) _____ - _____

Thank you again for participating. You should be receiving your check for \$20 within the next two weeks.

Appendix B

Categorization of Exit Codes

Appendix B

Categorization of Exit Codes

| Code | ADES Definition | Failure to meet financial eligibility requirements | Failure to meet categorical eligibility requirements | Failure to meet residence requirements | Failure to meet procedural requirements | Overdue recertification |
|------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| AE | Added in error – SEPA or TMA use | | ✓ | | | |
| AG | Age requirements not met | | ✓ | | | |
| AV | Failure to provide alien verification | | | | ✓ | |
| CH | Change in law or policy | | ✓ | | | |
| CM | Computer match, info validated | | ✓ | | | |
| CR | Currently receiving assistance/FS | | ✓ | | | |
| CS | CERA requirement(s) not met | | ✓ | | | |
| DC | No eligible dependent child | | ✓ | | | |
| DE | Disqualified E&T | | | | ✓ | |
| DF | Disqualified for IPV | | | | ✓ | |
| DH | Death | | ✓ | | | |
| DI | Income deemed | ✓ | | | | |
| DN | Not disabled | | ✓ | | | |
| DP | Deemed parent's excess income | ✓ | | | | |
| DR | Deemed resources | ✓ | | | | |
| DS | Deemed sponsor's excess income | ✓ | | | | |
| EI | Excessive income – no AHCCCS cc | ✓ | | | | |
| FD | Food distribution program particip | | ✓ | | | |
| FI | Failed to comply with finger imaging | | | | ✓ | |
| FR | Failure to complete AF/MA review | | | | ✓ | |
| FS | FS student eligibility req not met | | ✓ | | | |
| HV | Failure to appear at home visit | | | | ✓ | |
| IN | Failure to complete interview process | | | | ✓ | |
| LC | Loss of contact | | | | ✓ | |
| LD | Loss of Disr.:VQ, ref/quit job | | ✓ | | | |
| MB | Mom moved with newborn baby | | | ✓ | | |
| MO | Moved out of residence | | | ✓ | | |
| NA | Receives other public assistance/SSI | | ✓ | | | |
| NC | Noncompliance/Sanction | | | | ✓ | |
| ND | No deprivation | | ✓ | | | |
| NS | No services in prior quarter/month | | ✓ | | | |
| OR | Overdue recertification | | | | | ✓ |
| PB | Failure to apply poss ben (AF) | | | | ✓ | |
| PI | Failed to provide/verify info | | | | ✓ | |
| PM | Fail to apply poss ben (MA) | | | | ✓ | |
| PR | Failed to comply w/proc req | | | | ✓ | |
| PT | Pregnancy terminated | | ✓ | | | |
| QC | Refused to cooperate with QC | | | | ✓ | |
| QJ | Quit job hoh/non-hoh (FS) | | ✓ | | | |
| RB | Restored benefits only | | ✓ | | | |
| RE | Resources exceed maximum | ✓ | | | | |
| RI | Resident of institution | | | ✓ | | |
| RJ | Resides in jail or prison | | | ✓ | | |
| RP | Not resident of project area | | | ✓ | | |

(continued on next page)

Appendix B

Categorization of Exit Codes

| Code | ADES Definition | Failure to meet financial eligibility requirements | Failure to meet categorical eligibility requirements | Failure to meet residence requirements | Failure to meet procedural requirements | Overdue recertification |
|------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| RS | Not state resident | | | ✓ | | |
| RW | Reduced work effort (FS) | | | | ✓ | |
| SA | Sponsored alien: agency/organ | | ✓ | | | |
| SH | Not an eligible sep FS hh/PA unit | | ✓ | | | |
| SI | Sibling income | ✓ | | | | |
| SR | Not living with specific relative | | ✓ | | | |
| SS | Failed to furnish/apply for SSN | | | | ✓ | |
| SU | SSA excess income (FC) | ✓ | | | | |
| SV | Ineligible as result of "save" | | ✓ | | | |
| TD | Trans daycare – disregard expired | | ✓ | | | |
| TE | Trans coverage – earnings increase | | ✓ | | | |
| TI | Time limited | | ✓ | | | |
| UE | UP closure – expired time limit | | ✓ | | | |
| US | Citizen/40 quarter status not met | | ✓ | | | |
| VB | Voluntary withdrawal – both AF & FS | | | | ✓ | |
| VF | Voluntary withdrawal – FS | | | | ✓ | |
| VM | Voluntary withdr – moved out of state | | | ✓ | | |
| VR | Unable to verify resident address | | | | ✓ | |
| VW | Voluntary withdrawal – all programs | | | | ✓ | |
| WR | Fail to comply with work requirements | | | | ✓ | |
